

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 1, 1996
Volume 32—Number 13
Pages 549–592

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Anticancer initiative—587
- Cancer Control Month, proclamation signing ceremony—586
- National Association of Attorneys General—568
- New York, National Governors' Association education summit in Palisades—573
- Ohio
 - Community in Cincinnati—556
 - Democratic dinner in Columbus—563
 - Roundtable discussion in Cincinnati—551
- "One Strike and You're Out" initiative in public housing—582
- Radio address—549

Bill Signings

- Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996, statement—573

Communications to Congress

- Angola, message reporting—571
- Radiation control for health and safety, message transmitting report—581
- Trade agreements program, message transmitting report—582

Communications to Federal Agencies

- "One Strike and You're Out" guidelines, memorandum—584

Executive Orders

- Amendment to Executive Order 12873 (Federal acquisition, recycling, and waste prevention)—571
- Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System—569

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters in the Roosevelt Room—568

Proclamations

- Cancer Control Month—586
- Death of Edmund Sixtus Muskie—582
- Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.—589

Statements by the President

- See also* Bill Signings
- Congressional inaction on minimum wage legislation—585
- Death of Edmund Muskie—571
- Senate action on the line-item veto—585

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—592
- Checklist of White House press releases—592
- Digest of other White House announcements—590
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—590

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, March 29, 1996

The President's Radio Address

March 23, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about upholding our values, expanding our economy, and moving our country forward together; about giving every American family the opportunity to succeed in the new global economy; and about what some American businesses are doing and what more American businesses can do to increase economic opportunity and security for their employees and their families in a way that is good for business and grows our economy.

In the last 3 years I have worked hard to give the American people a Government that is more responsible, that promotes economic opportunity, brings Americans together, and challenges all Americans to take responsibility for themselves, their families, their communities, and their country. I've challenged parents to get more involved in their children's education. I've challenged welfare recipients to move from welfare to work. I've challenged the entertainment industry to put our children first and voluntarily rate the programs they put on television so parents can protect their children from excessive violence or other inappropriate material.

That same ethic of responsibility must guide all of us in our work lives as well. And I believe American business, the engine of our prosperity and the envy of the world, clearly has a role to play.

We've made much progress already. Three years ago our economy was drifting. The deficit was twice as high as it is today. Unemployment was high and job growth was very low. I took office determined to change our economic course. Since then we've cut the deficit in half, invested in the education and training of our people, expanded exports through tough trade agreements, and reduced the size of Government by over 200,000 while cutting regulations, giving more responsibilities to State and local gov-

ernments, limiting the abuse of lobbying, without cutting essential services.

And the American people have responded. In 3 years and a month, our economy has created 8.4 million new jobs, and every year more and more of them are good, higher paying jobs. The combined unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage rates are at their lowest levels in 27 years. We've halted the decade-long slide in real average hourly wages. Every year entrepreneurs have started a record number of new small businesses, and in key industries like autos and semiconductors, America now leads the world again.

We are moving in the right direction, but we must do more to grow the economy and to support America's working families. Too many Americans are still working harder and harder just to keep up, and they worry that they'll be left behind by the new economy. We have to make sure all Americans who are willing to work for it can be winners of economic change and that all of our people share in the benefits of our growing economy.

Of course, Government must play a role. We must finish the job of balancing the budget in 7 years to bring interest rates down even further. We should increase the minimum wage. We should ensure access to health care, to education, to training, to pensions for our people. We should reform welfare to move people from welfare to work.

But we know that business has a role to play, too, if we want people to have better lives, provide for their families, and face the future with confidence. Let me be clear: The most fundamental responsibility for any business is to make a profit, to create jobs and incomes by competing and growing. After all, in the last 3 years, nearly all the new jobs created in the world's advanced economies, nearly all of them, were made in America by American business.

We recognize, too, that not every business can afford to do more than worry about the bottom line, especially a lot of small businesses. But many of America's most successful businesses have shown that you can do well by doing right by employees and their families.

Let me mention five ways businesses can show good citizenship toward their employees:

First, they can be friendly to families. We know that most people play more than one role. We're employees and parents, too, and people have to be able to succeed at home and at work for America to succeed. So, many companies call for employees' flexible work schedules, help with child care, or good leave policies. And every business should let their employees know what is already their right under the Family and Medical Leave Act I signed into law: to take some time off without losing your job in case of a family emergency.

Second, businesses can give their employees health care and pension benefits. We're trying hard here in Washington to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill so that workers don't lose their insurance when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick. We passed pension reform legislation to protect the pensions of 40 million workers, and we're working to get money that is owed to pension funds paid in. We're also proposing to simplify rules so that small businesses can provide pensions for their workers and the owners of the businesses more easily. But business has to do more, too.

Third, businesses can invest in their most important asset, their employees. The most successful companies do give workers broad opportunity for improved education and training, both within the firm and outside it. Every worker should know that whatever the new economy brings, he or she will be ready. When workers lose their jobs, I want Government to be there with a "GI bill" for America's workers, a voucher worth up to \$2,500 a year so that people can immediately be retrained.

When people need further education, I want Government to provide up to \$10,000 a year in tax deduction for the cost of education after high school. But companies should do their part, too, with education and

training. Upgrading the skills of our existing work force is the single best way to raise the incomes of America's workers and the productivity of our businesses and the growth of our economy.

Fourth, businesses can work in partnership with their employees. That can mean giving employees a greater voice in the production process. It can mean collective bargaining. It can mean sharing the benefits of good times through stock bonuses, employee ownerships, and other means of gains sharing. And when layoffs are necessary for the long-term health of the company, the best companies provide adequate notice and good severance so employees have a chance at a new job with a good income.

Fifth, every company in America has a duty to provide a safe workplace. No one should have to put themselves at risk just to put food on the table at home. Government has a part to play, too, with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. But the safest workplaces are those that work in partnership, where the value at work is a safe and healthy workplace.

These acts of good corporate citizenship are good for employees, but many, many thousands of American businesses have proved they're good for business, too. Our changing economy puts a real premium on skill, ingenuity, creativity, and loyalty of the work force. The quality and productivity of America's workers are our greatest source of economic strength.

Family flexible workplaces, health care and pensions, training, partnership, safe workplaces: five challenges many of America's best businesses are now meeting. We want others to follow their lead. Government should support them in doing so. That's the way to create strong, lasting growth for our economy, and that's the way to make sure that every American, every American, has the chance to reap the rewards of economic change and economic growth.

We can meet these economic challenges the way we best meet all our challenges, by working together as partners, all of us doing our part. Remember, the greatest lesson of our democracy is this: When we are divided, we defeat ourselves, but when we are united, America never loses.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:54 p.m. on March 22 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 23.

**Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion
on Corporate Mentoring in
Cincinnati, Ohio**

March 23, 1996

[Moderator John Pepper, chief executive officer, Procter & Gamble, welcomed the President and noted that the city of Cincinnati recently had achieved victories in referendums for schools and construction of sports stadiums, along with the University of Cincinnati's entry into the NCAA basketball regional tournament. He noted that the President's interest in the basketball tournament might not be as great in 1996 as it had been in previous years.]

The President. Actually, I watched the game. They did very well.

Mr. Pepper. Looked really good. But we're pleased to be here and look forward to the dialog we can have and to answer your questions on these programs.

The President. Thank you.

[Mr. Pepper said that the mentor program was driven by Cincinnati's commitment to children and their education and that community involvement was widespread, through the sponsoring Cincinnati Youth Collaborative and organizations such as the United Way.]

The President. Thank you very much.

Well, I don't want to spend a lot of time talking. I came here to listen to you. But let me just make a couple of comments. First of all, to reiterate what John said, it is perfectly clear that no matter how many jobs we can generate in the private sector in America—and our country has done a very good job in the last 3 years. We've generated 8.4 million new jobs, by far more than any advanced country in the world. The other six big economies together have netted out about zero. Three of them have created a few thousand jobs; three of them have lost a few thousand jobs. America is producing jobs.

But if we want all Americans to do well, to be able to get a job, keep a job, and have a growing income, we've got to raise the education levels of the country and we have to do a better job of connecting school to work.

Now there are some things the Government can do. We've worked hard to increase our investment in Head Start, for example, to give schools more funds to try to meet strong national standards, to improve access to college through a better college loan program, and the national service program. I hope that Congress will adopt a balanced budget plan that will include a deduction of up to \$10,000 a year for the cost of education after high school. I think these things will all help.

But the main role of Government, I think, today is to work with the private sector in trying to keep the market successful in generating new jobs but also to create the conditions in which at each community level in America, in every community in the country, the business and education and ordinary citizens can work together to try to develop the capacity of every person. I mean, basically, that's what I am trying to achieve by the time I finish my service as President. I want a framework out there where the Government's role is to help create the conditions in which communities can solve their own problems and get the most out of their own people.

And the school to work initiative that we started back in 1993 gives funds to projects like this one, not to tell you what to do but just to empower you to work together to move young people through education and then into the work force. And so I heard a lot of great things about it, and I heard that John Pepper and Procter & Gamble were particularly active and that there were 1,500 other volunteers in this program. So I just wanted us to get a little more personal exposure to it.

And so, having said that, I'd like to turn it back to you.

Mr. Pepper. Very good. We'll go around the table, and we'll get comments. But obviously, at any point, Mr. President, if you want to go in a different direction, you tell us, and that's where we'll head.

First up is going to be Cathy Ingram. Cathy is the president of the school board of the Cincinnati public system, and she's got a few comments to make.

Cathy?

[Ms. Ingram called attention to the need for linkage between the community, businesses, schools, and parents in mentor programs. She said that the 70 percent approval rate in the school referendum was a sign that people are starting to realize a connection between education and their economic concerns.]

Mr. Pepper. I'd note that, from the very beginning, we've always had on the collaborative the president and vice president of the school board, most important to have that representation in that it be part of it rather than be seen as a separate body.

The President. I agree with that.

[Mr. Pepper then introduced John Bryant, executive director of the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative. Mr. Bryant said the program has 1,000 mentors drawn from all walks of life, working with students in elementary school through high school. He explained that at higher grade levels, students gain exposure to the world of work and then are eligible to receive college scholarships raised by corporations and to use a college information center sponsored by a manufacturing company.]

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Pepper. Thank you, John. I think next I'd like to call on Nathaniel Walker, Nate Walker. You met Nate, Mr. President. He's at Schroeder, and I don't think he would mind my telling you that today is his 13th birthday.

The President. Happy birthday.

Mr. Pepper. Nate is a mentee in our program, and I've heard him talk on this once before, and I know he's looking forward to this.

Nate?

[Mr. Walker said his mentor comes to his school once a week for half an hour to an hour and that they spend time together on work days and doing fun activities.]

The President. You say you spend about an hour a week with her?

Mr. Walker. Yes.

The President. Do you look forward to that hour every week?

Mr. Walker. Yes. When she's on travel, she sends me a postcard and tells me when she's coming back. It tells me why she wasn't there or something like that.

The President. You like that because it tells you that it's important to her, right?

Mr. Walker. Yes.

The President. Do you know a lot of other students that have mentors?

Mr. Walker. Yes, I know one of them. It's a girl that went to my school. She said—we got in the same magnet school, and she's got a tutor.

The President. And does she like hers?

Mr. Walker. I don't talk to her about that.

The President. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Walker. You're welcome.

The President. Happy birthday.

Mr. Walker. Thank you.

The President. Hope you have a good day.

[Mr. Pepper then introduced Miriam Mazuka, who commented on the positive outcome seen in students who are being mentored, including reduced school dropouts and fewer teen pregnancies. She added that 1,000 students are waiting for mentors.]

The President. And you say you have about 1,000?

Ms. Mazuka. We have 1,007 serving as mentors in a one-to-one relationship, and we have about 200 people that are just tutoring youngsters. And we have this long, long waiting list of students who want to be matched.

The President. How many do you have who want to have mentors that don't?

Ms. Mazuka. Well, you know, we stopped keeping track of that, because the list goes on and on and on. It's a matter of supply and demand now. It's over 1,000.

The President. So it's virtually unlimited. So if you had a thousand more adults in the community who would do it——

Ms. Mazuka. We have a thousand youngsters——

The President. ——just your students.

Ms. Mazuka. Absolutely.

The President. Well, maybe my coming here will help you get some more mentors.

Ms. Mazuka. I certainly hope so.

The President. We are formally sending out an appeal to the Cincinnati community.

Mr. Pepper. I'll just add to that by—

The President. What's that?

Mr. Pepper. —holding up that telephone number. [Laughter]

The President. That's right.

Mr. Pepper. You know, this is just relentless promotion if we go all around. That number is 475-4959, if you can't read it. And we literally have 700 youngsters right now who have held up their hand and asked for a mentor, and we don't have it. And this does work. This changes lives.

The President. That's terrific. Thank you.

[Mr. Pepper introduced student Vernelia Britton, who told of her experience observing and learning to be an administrative assistant at W.R. Grace.]

The President. Do you know other students that are in this program?

Ms. Britton. Yes.

The President. Do they all like it?

[Ms. Britton replied in the affirmative. Mr. Pepper next called upon Paul Laws of W.R. Grace, who said the program benefited the students by giving them work experience and helping them make career decisions, and it benefited employers by providing a pool of already trained workers. Mr. Pepper then said 79 companies are taking part in the job training.]

The President. And does each company essentially take one student?

Mr. Laws. We have two. We've taught enough volunteers—we have two mentors on site, actually formed two little teams, one for administrative and one for operations, where Vernelia will learn various duties in the administrative area and another mentee will learn the duties of operations and plant, lab, along those lines—engineering.

Mr. Pepper. It's typically one or two, but we do up to as high as six.

Mr. Bryant. We can go up to six, but at the present time, we don't have any more than four at the present time. But in terms of the original planning, anywhere from one to six.

The President. You know, I think this is so important because we as a nation, we for

many years made a strict sort of division between a world of school and a world of work, and even within school between academic courses and vocational courses. And now all those lines are blurring, and that's a very good thing.

You know, for example, some people learn better, learn academic subjects better in practical settings. We know that—we also know that the world of work and the world of learning can no longer be easily divided, because people have to keep learning at work for a lifetime.

And one of the problems that I saw first when I was a Governor, working with both businesses and schools, and then when I became President, is that we have no real system in our country for acquainting young people with the world of work and moving them easily into the world of work. And I think it will strengthen their academic performance. That would be my guess. And I think it will also ultimately, therefore, be in the interest of the business community as well to have these kinds of programs. I thank you very much for your work you're doing.

Senator John Glenn. Mr. President, can I ask a question?

The President. Sure, John.

Senator Glenn. You may have a lot of people who want to be mentors, but they don't quite know how they can get into this thing or what they'd run into. Do you do any training of them? I think you would have a lot of people that might want to get into this if you did training. Do you have a training program? The screening program was mentioned but not anything about a training program. And how long does that take? Because I think this is something that could spread to other cities all over the country. I think it's an excellent program.

[Ms. Mazuka described the mentor training program. Mr. Pepper explained that Federal funds were used to start the job training and said he doubted the program would have been started if that money was not available. He then introduced Jan Leslie of Partners in Education, which matches companies with public and private schools to provide mentoring, tutoring, and assistance in developing curriculum. This assistance led to pub-

lic schools being able to decrease their administrative staffs by 50 percent, she said.]

The President. Is that right?

Ms. Leslie. Yes, yes. It was a tremendous challenge for the superintendent and the board, but they took it on. And with the help of business volunteers and teams of business volunteers have restructured both their systems and operations and how they do their work. And the leadership and commitment in this community of John Pepper, of the mayor, of the board, and the superintendent coming together and being committed I think has set a tone for a lot of individual volunteers. But tremendous corporate support also.

The President. Were you on the school board when this happened?

[Ms. Ingram replied that she joined the school board 2 years after the corporate involvement began in 1991 and that some educators are skeptical of whether corporate methods can be applied in schools. She acknowledged that companies do contribute expertise in areas such as inventory and purchasing that are unfamiliar to educators.]

The President. I think it's very important. The administrative cost of American public education has gotten very high. And part of it is because of the school districts get their money from the local district, from the State, from the Federal Government. Part of it is because these programs sort have built up over time that they have to manage. There are a lot of reasons for that.

But in a world in which administrative overhead is going down dramatically everywhere else because of computer technology and new management techniques and where there's a limit to how much money you can raise, it's very important to be able to demonstrate I think, for matters of good education, that you've lowered administrative costs and put it back into direct education.

The Federal Government today has 205,000 fewer people working for it than it did the day I became President. And we have very good severance packages, early retirement packages. We weren't just throwing people out, you know. But with the smallest Government that we've had since 1965, and by the end of the year it will be the smallest

it's been since 1962, that helps us to get the deficit down and it also frees up money for real direct services to people. In the education context, that's real education programs, it's more of the things we're talking about today.

I know it's not the subject we came here to talk about, but you caught my attention. *[Laughter]* I have to go meet with—I'm going to meet with the Governors next week. They're having an update on the educational summit we held back in 1989. And it's one of the things that I've been trying to get updated on. So I thank you.

[Mr. Pepper next introduced Sister Rose Ann Fleming of Xavier University, which has its own academic mentoring program for students.]

Sister Fleming. Mr. President, it's a pleasure to have you here on campus.

The President. Thank you.

[Sister Fleming described the university's programs, including those for university student-athletes. She mentioned that in the last 14 years she has been connected with the program, every basketball player who has played for 4 years has graduated.]

The President. That's fantastic.

Sister Fleming. And we're looking forward to the same thing continuing. So I think for the underscoring of what has been said here today through the training and mentors and work with young people, like Nate here, a one-to-one relationship is the key to a successful development of the individual, and that's what the university is all about.

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Pepper. That really completes the comments that we wanted to have the group make, and we'd obviously be glad to expand on any of that, or if you have any comments.

The President. I just want to ask one question of either Mr. Bryant or whoever else: How many students do you have in your summer jobs and summer school program?

[Mr. Bryant replied that there are a combined 460 students in the summer programs, in addition to those in the Youth Employment Services program, which provide about 1,200 jobs. The next participant then encouraged the President to ensure that the Federal Gov-

ernment remains a partner in youth training programs.]

The President. If I might just offer one or two comments. First of all, I want to thank each and every one of you, not only for being here today but for what you're doing with your lives, because I think it's very important. And secondly, I want to thank a number of you for what you said about these programs, and John, what you said about the pilot project.

Let me say what the problem is. If you come from Washington and you come to Cincinnati and you say to yourself: What is the connection between the National Government and what we're doing, do they have any responsibility in Washington to help us do what we're doing here, and if so, what is it?

You know, when I took office, the deficit was twice as big as it is now, the national debt quadrupled; we had to get it down. I've tried to take the position that in reducing the deficit, we ought not to be cutting our investments in education, and we ought to be not telling local communities how to deal with things like this, but giving them some research fund or some pilot project funds, if you will, to help them explore what works, and then keep funding what plainly works, like the student loan programs and the summer job programs; these things plainly work. And there's not enough to serve everybody, so if we provide the base, then perhaps you can come in and raise money on top of the base.

So I've been quite heartened by what I've seen today because I know that most of this work has to be done at the community level, and that is a good thing. How could anyone in Washington know whether W.R. Grace in Cincinnati could take 2 young students or 5 or 3 or 25 or anybody? So this has to be done at the local level.

What we must do in Washington is to make the National Government relevant and trustworthy and effective for the 21st century. And that means we have to get our own house in order; we can't—we have to balance the budget, but we also have to decide what it is we're going to invest in and what our objective is.

It seems to me our objective ought to be to keep America the world's greatest job generator and then to make sure that our young people are trained to do good jobs and have successful lives so that they can be rewarded in this new world they're living in. And that means that a lot of the actual work and how it's done must be decided by these kinds of community partnerships, but the National Government has to create the conditions in which they can flourish. That's what I'm trying to do.

A lot of the times you hear these great debates in Washington, you know, they sound—they may sound abstract to you. But actually what the debate is, is a debate about everyone knows the economy's changed, that it involves more mind and less muscle and it's more global and less local, and everybody knows, therefore, that—and all businesses are changing and there again, the Government has to change. And we're trying to define—our great challenge is to define what it is our responsibility is to help you do what you're doing.

One of the things a President can do, of course, is to use the bully pulpit. I mean, I just made a plea for more mentors here. [Laughter] But also to try to make sure that if we are creating these conditions, that people know what you're doing here in Cincinnati with the Youth Collaborative, because I think this is a good model that could be carried all across America. You know, I wish every community had this level of intense and organized partnership, and I'm very grateful to you. And I also feel that I have learned, and I think Senator Glenn probably feels the same way I do, that at least I think I have a clearer idea about exactly what our responsibilities in Washington are to help you do what you're doing here, and I thank you for that, all of you.

Thank you.

Mr. Pepper. We're glad you're here, and thank you very much for coming. I guarantee it will leave us just more energized.

The President. Great day. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in Schmidt Hall at Xavier University.

Remarks to the Community in Cincinnati

March 23, 1996

Thank you so much. Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you, Mayor Qualls, for the kind things you said, for making me feel so welcome here, for your outstanding leadership for Cincinnati. And congratulations on the recent success of your education and your stadium referendum. That was a very impressive thing.

Thank you, Father Hoff, for making me feel so welcome here at Xavier. You know, I graduated from Georgetown. I tell everyone I'm the closest Baptist you'll ever get to a Jesuit. *[Laughter]* And I'm delighted to be here. The Jesuits have always been famous for their humility. *[Laughter]* I hope Father Hoff doesn't get in trouble for saying that now that I had seen the Pope three times I could finally come to Xavier. *[Laughter]* But I'm trying to move up in life, and I enjoyed it. *[Applause]* Thank you.

I want to say a warm word of thanks to my good friend Senator John Glenn. Hillary and I admire John and his wonderful wife, Annie, so much. I want all of you to know that one of the most challenging jobs we've had in Washington in the last 3 years is to figure out how to downsize the Government without undermining the quality of service we're giving to the American people. And we now have the smallest Federal Government in 30 years. It's 205,000 people smaller than it was when I took office. By the end of this year it will be the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President.

But if you want to do that in ways that first, are humane to the employees involved, that do the maximum amount through early retirement or give the employees time to find other jobs and generous severance packages and don't hurt public services, it takes a really careful strategy. And the leadership of John Glenn, from his committee, telling us how to do this and helping us do it, was absolutely essential. And the whole country is in his debt for that and for many other things, and I wanted to say that in front of his constituents today so that you could know he deserves a lion's share of the credit for what we did.

I'd like to thank the young musicians for playing "Hail to the Chief" so well. Thank you very much. I'd also like to say that Felisha Coady can sing for me any time. I thought she was great.

You know, I love coming to Cincinnati today because Cincinnati really disproves something that Mark Twain said about you a long time ago. *[Laughter]* Remember what Mark Twain said about Cincinnati: "If the world would end, I'd come to Cincinnati, because everything happens here 10 years later." *[Laughter]* That's not true.

Cincinnati is ahead of the times in many ways. I saw it today in looking at the remarkable work that you're doing with the communications between the school systems here and the universities and the business community, trying to help every young person succeed. I saw it in the votes that were cast in the referendum. I see it in the growth of the phenomenal businesses you have here.

I see it in your successful obsession with basketball. I see it in many ways. So I am honored to be here today. And what I want to talk to you about today is something that will affect the lives of every person in this audience, but especially the young people. And let me begin with a little background.

I ran for President in 1992, having been Governor of my State for 12 years, because I was literally obsessed with trying to deal with all the sweeping changes going on in our Nation and world in a way that would allow us as a people to achieve three critical objectives. One is, I wanted then and I want now for this country to go into the 21st century in a way that every American who is willing to work for it will have a shot at the American dream.

Secondly, I wanted to maintain the leadership of the United States at the end of the cold war as the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, for security and prosperity.

And thirdly, I wanted to see this country come together around its basic values, not be divided as it too often is, especially in election season. If you were to ask me 3 years later what the most important lesson as President I have learned, it is this, simply: When we are divided, we defeat ourselves; when we work together, America always wins.

And so I began to work on these objectives. I believed that we needed a new economic policy. I believed we needed a new social policy that emphasized personal responsibility as well as giving people the opportunity to escape the problems before them. I believed that we needed a new, aggressive, sharply focused policy in the world that got America more fair trade agreements and reduced the threats of not only nuclear war but terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. And I thought we had to dramatically change the role of Government, to make it smaller and less bureaucratic and less burdensome but still very strong and effective in working with the private sector to create an environment in which individual citizens and families and businesses and schools and community groups could make the most of their own lives by working together.

Now, 3 years later, you see the incredibly impressive dimensions of the time in which we are living, including some things that seem to be paradoxical. And so let me describe this time as I see it to explain why I've come here to talk about this issue of not only our responsibility in Government, but business' responsibility to make a better future for the United States and for the working people of America.

Consider just the last 3 years. Three years ago we had much higher unemployment. The jobs we were creating were overwhelmingly lower paying jobs. The deficit was more than twice as big as it is now. Well, after 3 years the good news is that the deficit is half of what it was 3 years ago; that our economy has produced over 8.4 million jobs; that in 1995, most of those jobs actually paid above average wages, not below, those new jobs; we've had 3 years in a row of record new formations of small businesses; our trade is at an all-time high with other countries; interest rates have been low for home mortgages, so home ownership's at a 15-year high.

That is the good news, and that is good news. America has recovered our lost lead. We now lead again the world in the sales of automobiles and semiconductors. Every year there is a World Economic Forum in Europe that votes on the most productive economies in the world. After we had slipped

to fifth 4 years ago, for the last 3 years we've been voted first by a panel of international economists again. America is number one. That's good news.

If you look at where we are with our social problems—the crime rate is lower, the welfare rolls are lower, the food stamp rolls are lower, the poverty rate is lower, the teen pregnancy rate has dropped—what has gone up is child support collections in the last 3 years. I think that's very hopeful for all of us.

Now, we'll never come together again until we acknowledge some truths, though, the other side of this time of change. First, on the social side, all of those things are lower, but they're all still too high. They're all still too high. And I'm not going to talk at great length about that today, but I will say this: If we know what brings the crime rate down, which is more police officers on the street and community policing, effective partnerships in the community, and giving our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to, we ought to do more of it, not less of it. We shouldn't turn away from that.

If we know now, because I have given the States and localities more freedom to experiment in the area of welfare in 3 years than occurred in the past 12 years combined, even though the Congress has still not passed welfare reform legislation that is both tough on work and good for children, almost three-quarters of the people on welfare in America today are under welfare reform experiments, because our executive branch has just told the States to have at it. And if we know what works, which is investing in children, providing work alternatives, being tough and requiring people to go to work, but making sure there is a job there and making sure the kids aren't punished, then we ought to do more of it, not less of it. That's what we ought to do. We need to do that.

But let me come back now to the economy. How do you square all of those good statistics I just gave you with the fact that you constantly read articles about businesses downsizing; you constantly read articles about people who've worked harder and harder without a raise in years and years; you constantly see from your own experience that

there are communities that have not been touched by any economic recovery? How can those two things be squared?

I want to focus on that today and what everybody's responsibility is. The truth is that the good news is true and so is the bad news. So are the problems. They're both true. Why? Because we are entering a new economy that is so different that we're going through the period of most profound change that we've been through in 100 years. It was 100 years ago when most Americans stopped living on the farm and started living in towns, cities; 100 years ago when most people stopped working on the farm and started working in factories or in businesses that supported factories or depended upon them.

And when that happened, there was a great uprooting of the patterns of life in America and a lot of people had untold new opportunities and a lot of people had a lot of money that they never had before. And a lot of people were left out in the cold and sort of felt like they were twisting in the wind.

And America developed what was called then a new progressive movement—and its first embodiment was a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt—which began to ask the question: What are we going to have to do together to reap the benefits of the industrial era when most of us are now living in towns and cities, not living in the country anymore, in order that every American will be treated fairly and we can grow stronger together? That's what the big debate was.

That debate went on for 50 years from the late 1800's arguably until the end of World War II, when with the GI bill and a lot of other things, the United States of America built the greatest middle class the world has ever known and we had 30 years in which all Americans' incomes were growing, whether they were in the poorest part of our income scheme or the wealthiest part. And we had a very strong, growing country that was growing together.

Then along comes the information and technology revolution. And now most economic markets are not national, they're international, the market for money, the market for products, the market for services, more

and more global. Now most work is done with the mind, not with muscle, even in factories. Now, because of the information revolution, the nature of the workplace itself is changing.

How could I reduce the Federal Government by 205,000 people and nobody know it in Cincinnati? Why? Because of the digital chip. Because fewer people can do more work that is related to information gathering and dissemination. It is the most sweeping change in 100 years.

Bill Gates, the great computer genius who founded Microsoft, says that the digital chip is the most significant change in communications in 500 years since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe. And that explains how you can have all this basically good news and still hear these gripping stories of people who are caught in the crosswinds of change.

There are basically three groups of Americans who are caught in those crosswinds. Number one, there are people who live in isolated inner-city neighborhoods and isolated rural neighborhoods who have felt no economic recovery because they don't have new jobs there; it's hard to get the investment in.

Number two, there are the people, principally those in the bottom half of the hourly wage earners of America, who work harder and harder and don't seem to ever get a raise because they don't have a special educational skill that a rich country can pay high rewards to in a global economy where people who live for things we can't live on can send products into our markets.

And number three, there are these people who have worked all their lives for big companies that are now being downsized either because they have to, to survive, or because if they do it, they can make more money because they don't need as many people, especially in middle management, anymore. And you've been seeing a lot of their gripping stories. A lot of them are about my age.

You know, when you're 50 years old and you've worked for the same company for 25 years and you've got two kids about to go to college and you get laid off and you think, "My goodness, I'll never get a job paying this again; how am I going to send my kids to college," it's not a very comfortable thing for

somebody to say, "Well, relax, the President just signed a telecommunications bill and it's going to create 3 million jobs in the next few years; go to work for Sprint or MCI." And you say, "But I'd have to go 500 miles away and I've got this home mortgage and I've got these two kids that are just about to get out of high school and what am I supposed to do?"

So the good news is true, folks, and it's important. The United States has created 8.4 million jobs in the last 3 years and 1 month. And during that time the people in the other big six economies of the world have created a net zero. Three of the countries have created a few thousand jobs, three of the countries have lost a few thousand jobs; they netted out zero. So the big seven economies of the world have created 8.4 million jobs in the last 3 years, all of them in America. I wouldn't give that up for anything in the world. That's nothing to sneeze at. That's something we should want.

So the question is, how do we do today what was done 100 years ago? How do we keep the dynamism of the American economy? How do we go forward into the future with great confidence? How do we do it together in a way that enables us to achieve our objectives? Every American willing to work for it has a shot at the American dream. We have stronger families and better childhoods for all of our people. How are we going to do that? That is what I want to talk about today.

Yes, the Government has certain responsibilities. I've described some of the things we have already done. There are other things that we should do in Government. We ought to finish the work of balancing the budget to get interest rates down even further in a way that will enable us to invest and grow our economy. We ought to do that without cutting our investments in things like education and the environment and research and technology and college loans and college scholarships, the things that will grow the economy. We should do that, and we can do it.

We ought to pass some tax relief for average families, and I think the most important tax benefit we could give America at a time when education is critical to income in the

future is to give every American family a deduction of up to \$10,000 a year for the cost of college education. I believe that.

Now, there are other things that we ought to do. But let's face it, one of the things that we have done in downsizing the Government is to become even more reliant on the private sector. A far higher percentage of the new jobs created in our administration are private sector jobs, as compared with the jobs created in the previous 12 years. I want it that way. But if that is true, that means that this new era puts even more responsibility on that private sector, not only to grow and do well, but to help in dealing with the dislocations, the problems, and the challenges that this new age imposes upon us.

That's what I want to talk about today. And I don't want to ask you if you agree with me on all these things, but at least I want you to think about this, because we have to succeed as citizens, as workers, and as parents in order for America to grow. We all have mutual roles. And let me begin again by saying what I said before: Our business community is the engine of economic growth that's the envy of the entire world. The most fundamental responsibility of any business in a free enterprise system is to make a profit. That's how they hire people and pay them. That's how they serve their consumers. So that's important.

But we recognize that there are other responsibilities as well. Some businesses are in trouble and some businesses are so small they can only worry about the bottom line. But what I want to say to you today is that a lot of businesses in America today never make the headlines because what they're doing is good in trying to help people cope with all these changes. And in trying to help their employees cope with these changes, they're actually making more money.

So as we look ahead, we should ask ourselves what is the role of Government in this new era? It should be smaller, it should be less bureaucratic, but it should be strong enough to help to create a climate which enables people to make the most of their own lives. What is the role of business in this new era? It should first and foremost do well, make money so you can hire people and contribute. But it should, whenever possible, do

well in a way that strengthens families and grows the middle class in a way that develops a loyal, productive work force for the business and keeps the middle class alive so we can support all these businesses by buying the goods and services that they produce. That is the balance that we must seek to achieve.

It is also true that none of us exists in a vacuum. Business leaders would be the first to say that they are not motivated solely by economic considerations. I just talked about the work here done in Cincinnati in trying to develop the capacities of our young people here. And John Pepper of Procter & Gamble was there. They've invested a lot of money in this. I don't know if it helps their bottom line in the short run, but in the long run it's the morally right thing to do. I think it will turn out to be good for the company, by building a community that's positive to live in.

The other day I was with three grocery store chains who announced that they were going to give up all their vending machines for cigarettes because they couldn't enforce the law that says it's illegal for young people under the age of 18 to smoke and they didn't want to be a part of it so they're just going to give up the income. They're just going to give it up.

So I think it's important to recognize that there are a lot of incredibly good things going on in the private sector today. And that's what I want to talk to you about, because the people of this country are our most important asset. And our ability, first of all, to develop the educational capacity of our people, and secondly, to develop good values and a good sense of partnership in every workplace in America is going to be critical to our future. Because you look at the work—you can move technology anywhere. You can now move information anywhere. You can move money anywhere in the flash of an eye. What we have that is special—what you have that is special in Cincinnati are what's been done here already and the people who live here. That's what's special. That's the key to the future.

So I believe that the Government has a responsibility to create a framework in which the economy can grow. And the Government

has a responsibility to help people who fall between the cracks in this new era.

The private sector also has some challenges facing it, and many companies are meeting those challenges. Let me just mention five; one or two were mentioned by Senator Glenn. First and most important, we have to encourage companies to be more family friendly, because most parents work, most parents work. Most of us who are parents believe that that's still our most important job. For all my responsibilities to you, I still think it's my most important job.

So we have got to work for a country where people can succeed at home and at work. Let's take Procter & Gamble. I'll talk about their policy. When a P&G employee gives birth to a child, she gets a year of maternity leave; then eligible for up to 5 years of reduced work hours to have more time to care for the child. Now, arguably, that costs some money. But, arguably, you get it back in a fanatically loyal employee who can stay with the company for a longer period of time. Not every company can afford to do that, but those who do wind up doing pretty well. The company offers direct subsidies for child care, so that children can have a more safe and secure environment.

The first major bill I signed into law was the Family and Medical Leave Act, which requires most companies except the very smallest ones to at least give people some time off without losing their job when there's a baby born, a sick parent, or some other kind of family emergency. I think that that is a very important principle. If we want to succeed in a world where most parents have to work, then the workplace has to be more family friendly. And the Government and all the rest of us should do whatever we can to give the incentives and the encouragement to the business sector to make those workplaces family friendly.

Secondly, we need to encourage companies, even the smaller businesses, to find ways to give their employees access, at least, to health care and to retirement. You know, now that more and more people are working for smaller companies, we have a smaller percentage of people in the work force with health insurance tied to their job than we did 10 years ago. And we're the only wealthy

country in the world that doesn't provide a system for health insurance for all working families when they're under 65; Medicare takes care of it for everybody over 65.

This is a big challenge. The same thing is true with pensions. More and more small businesses are developing what are called defined contribution plans instead of defined benefit plans. And more and more people now are changing jobs before they stay 10 years on the job and before their pension vests.

So what do we have to do? We don't want to stop the dynamism in the economy. If you try to freeze things, unemployment will go up. We want to keep creating jobs. So what do we have to do? We have to develop health care packages that people can carry around with them from job to job. We have to make it easier for small businesses to take out pension plans for the owners and the employees. And we have to develop some portability provisions so that people can carry those pension plans around, including being able to stop contributing in the period when they're unemployed and pick it up again, and make up the difference. We've got to do some things like that if we want people to do well over the long run.

I met a young man at the airport when I came in today, wrote me a letter about his mother not being able to get health insurance, and it led to his mother being able to get health insurance. But the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill that Senator Glenn spoke about is the first step along the way. It doesn't solve all the problems, but it's a first step along our journey to developing a system that will enable the economy to continue to grow and provide some economic security for families who need it. It simply says that you can't automatically lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when somebody in the family gets sick. That's what health insurance is for, to cover people when they get sick.

We also need to make it easier for small businesses to buy in the insurance pools that are large so they can buy insurance more cheaply. But we also need to encourage and laud and lift up companies that provide these kinds of benefits. Starbucks Coffee is a big chain now in America; it hasn't always been

a big chain. But they provide health insurance for their employees, quite unusual in that kind of business. And why do they do it? Well, they think it's the right thing to do, but they also conducted an analysis of why there was so much turnover in that line of work. And one reason was all these young people who work for them said, we can't get any health insurance, we would stay a year and go do something else.

So they discovered that it cost them \$1,500 to train a new employee, which meant if they bought health insurance for their work force—most of whom are young, healthy, and single—and they stay 3 years instead of one year, they would make up all the money and still some. So sometimes it's possible to do right and do well, and we should encourage that.

The other thing we need to do is to do more to encourage companies and to challenge them to invest in their employees. I got a letter the other day from a man who is head of a big high-tech company who said the single most significant challenge facing the American people today in the area of education is reeducating the existing work force; it's the only way to get incomes up. We have got to help people do that.

Now, there are lots of companies that are doing this. The American people need to know about it. We need to lift them up. Others need to be encouraged to follow their lead. They should get telephone calls and ask how they did it and made money besides. You take one of my favorites, Harley-Davidson, because they brought motorcycles back to America; they set up basic reading, writing, and math skills instruction at an on-site learning center and they made money out of doing it because their employees became more productive.

Xerox, a lot of other companies, do this. United Technologies will permit a person who is an employee there to go back to school for any degree program, whatever, it doesn't even have to have anything to do with their job, and they'll pay a lot of the tuition and give them half the time off.

We need to look at what the policies of good companies are and lift these companies up and ask ourselves: Is there something the Government can do, something the commu-

nity can do to make it easier for others to do this? But this is an important thing.

The fourth important point, I believe, is to encourage business to work in greater partnership with their employees. That can mean a lot of things. It can mean a greater voice in the production process, it can mean good faith in collective bargaining, it can mean gain-sharing of all kinds, sharing the benefits when times are good if you have to share the burden when times are bad. It can mean that when there has to be layoffs, it can mean having policies that really work, to at least let the employees know that you're doing your best to make sure they can move from this life to another one.

I was at an interesting company in California a couple of weeks ago, Harman International, where they make a lot of electronic speakers for sound systems for automobiles and offices and homes and everything else. There's great fluctuation in their orders. But to try to keep their work force whole and loyal, they set up a whole new business called Olé, Off Line Enterprises, and they used all of their scrap materials to let their employees design products having nothing to do with their main line of work and then sell them. And they were able to keep a couple of hundred employees all the time that otherwise would have gone out on the street, so they can call them back without wrecking their lives. It made the company money, but it also made the company a world reputation among the work force that they cared about them and they were trying to keep them whole in the tough times. We need to encourage things like that and support them.

If you look at what Cinergy here in Cincinnati did, they had to trim their work force by 10 percent, and they did it by the beginning of this year without laying off a single, solitary soul. That's an important thing. They did it through early retirement incentives, through voluntary generous severance packages, and they have now put in a policy of no layoffs between now and 1999.

Now, the Government can't make all companies do this; for one thing, not every company could do it. There are too many differences in the market. But we all ought to be out here knowing that these things are going on and that they're good, and we ought

to be able to get this information out all across America, so when other companies are confronted with these challenges, they will ask themselves: Are there things I can do to support the economic security of the families of the people who are working for me? Are there things the Government could do not to make me do this, because you can't freeze the future, but at least to create a climate in which it would be easier for me to do this and still do well?

The last point I want to make is that every company has a duty to provide a safe workplace. Now, a lot of people see this as the Government's duty, and it is to some extent. For 25 years or more the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has had the responsibility of providing a safe workplace, and I've opposed the attempts in the Congress to weaken OSHA and to undermine its budget and to make it turn back on its mission.

Fundamentally, what you want is for the value of every company to be a safe and healthy workplace. You take Motorola. I'm proud that we worked with Motorola to open up the Japanese market to their cellular telephones and help them create jobs in America. But I'm even prouder in some ways that because of their own safety programs, their own safety training—things that Government does not require them to do—injuries are 70 percent below the industry average in those plants. That's the sort of thing we ought to encourage.

OSHA ought to be out doing more of what we're trying to do now, making partnerships with companies and saying, look, if you can figure out how to have a safer, better workplace, we could care less, you can throw the rulebook away. We're interested in results. We want the employees to feel good when they go to work every day. We want them to participate in making the workplace safer.

These are the elements of corporate citizenship that together with the proper policies from the Government will enable us to move into the 21st century with the American dream alive for everybody. Just think about it, five simple things: family friendly workplaces; health care and pensions; training and education; more partnership; and safe and healthy workplaces. Five challenges that the

rest of us ought not only to encourage the business community in America to meet, but to help them to meet wherever we can.

Soon I will announce—I will invite, excuse me, the chief executive officers of some of our country's best companies to come to Washington for a conference on corporate citizenship before I leave for Japan and Russia next month. And we are going to talk about the good things that are being done and how we can spread them. We're going to talk about not how we can complain about the disruptions that the global economy is bringing to America, but how we can do something about it to guarantee more economic security to the American families that are out there doing the best they can and working hard.

Let me say again, there is no running away from this future. We don't have to run away. This country can compete and win and maintain its standard of living and enhance it. And that is the only way we can maintain our standard of living and enhance it. You will not find a country that has run away from the global economy who is doing as well as the United States is. We can't run away. And we cannot do anything that will try to freeze the dynamism of the economy; otherwise we won't be able to create jobs.

But we can lift up those companies that are doing a good job. We can ask ourselves relentlessly, what sort of Government policies in Washington, in Columbus, or in Cincinnati can help companies to do better? And we can continue to work together to create a climate in which every single workplace will want to be identified with these five characteristics.

I say again, we have got to do this together. The thing that works in the world we're living in is working together. And when America works together, we always win.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:28 p.m. in the Schmidt Memorial Field House at Xavier University. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Roxanne Qualls of Cincinnati; Rev. James E. Hoff, president, Xavier University; and John E. Pepper, chief executive officer, Procter & Gamble, and co-chair, Cincinnati Youth Collaborative.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Columbus, Ohio

March 23, 1996

Thank you very much. I'll tell you, I've been around John Glenn a lot—that's the best darn speech I ever heard him give. [Laughter] Let me see if I can remember that, "You don't make America stronger by taking Big Bird away from 5-year-olds, school lunches away from 10-year-olds, summer jobs away from 15-year-olds, or student loans away from 20-year-olds." That's a pretty good line. That's a good line.

I want to thank our National Chairman, Don Fowler, for his tireless work and for being here, and your remarkable State Party Chair, David Leland, for this incredible event. I thank you, sir, and all who worked on it. I thank all the distinguished officials that are up here on the dais with me, and especially my colleagues, Congressman Sherrod Brown, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, and Congressman Tom Sawyer. Thank you for your fine work.

I have, I understand, two friends out in the audience, former colleagues, your former Attorney General Lee Fisher and your former Governor Dick Celeste, hello to you wherever you are and thank you for being here. Ladies and gentlemen, Ted Strickland, is he here? Where are you, Ted? Thank you.

I want to thank the remarkable Central State University marching band, thank you very much for playing. I'd like to thank the others who performed before I came out here, America's Pride and Darla's Dancers and Madeline Rebera, thank you all.

I have a very great deal to be thankful to Ohio for, as it has been pointed out. The votes of Ohio on June 2, 1992, made me the nominee of the Democratic Party. The votes of the Ohio delegation in New York City in June of 1992, or July of 1992, officially made me the nominee of the Democratic Party. On Election Night in 1992 in November, Ohio put the Clinton-Gore ticket over the top, and we thank you for that.

More recently, I want to thank especially the people of Dayton for hosting the Bosnian peace talks and giving the United States a chance to play a role in settling the bloodiest

conflict in Europe since World War II, promoting peace, saving lives, and thereby avoiding a war which our young people might be drawn into. I thank you for hosting those peace talks.

Let me say, having been traveling around the country now for the last couple of weeks, if anybody in this room had anything to do with settling the GM strike, there's 150,000 people that want to thank you, too, all across America for the chance to go back to work.

Ladies and gentlemen, most of what needs to be said to the Democrats of Ohio has already been said here tonight. I have a lot of gratitude in my heart. I want to thank all of the people from Ohio who now serve or who have served in our administration and all of you who have helped us to move this country forward.

But I want you to understand clearly, without any reservation, that this election represents a turning point in American history. In 1992, the real question was whether we would just sort of continue to drift along or whether we would change the course of America. In 1996, the decision will be between two very different paths of change. There is no status quo option.

And when I ran for President in 1992, I told you that my vision for America was a country in which every person, without regard to their region, their income, their race could have a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities, to share in the American dream if they were willing to work for it; an America that led the world for peace and freedom and prosperity and security; and an America where we valued and respected each other so that we came together around our basic values of work and family and community, instead of being divided by the cheap, short-term, divisive tactics that many have used in the other party to divide the American people at every election season. That's the America I want, an America coming together and moving forward and meeting the challenges of the future.

And my message to you is that the record that Senator Glenn talked about is not a record to sit on, it's a record to build on, because what has happened is—for all the progress we have made, you know America still has many challenges, and I think every

American understands at some level, maybe just instinctively, that this is not a normal time, that we are going through a period of very profound economic and social change. I believe and I said all over America that our Nation today is changing economically more than it has at any time in a century, since people moved in Ohio from the farm to small towns and cities, since they moved from making a living primarily in agriculture to making a living primarily out of manufacturing.

Today the American people and people all over the world are moving from an economy that is based on their national markets to one based on world markets. They're moving whether they work in the factory, on the farm, or in offices from an economy where mind is more and more important and muscle is less and less important. They're moving into economy where work forces are being radically restructured because the little digital chip means that you can communicate more information more quickly with fewer people than anyone would have imagined even 10 years ago.

It has been at least 100 years since we have dealt with changes of this scope. And as with every period of great change, there are vast new opportunities created for people, but there is also uprooting and uncertainty. And our great challenge today is to take the positive things that have happened, that Senator Glenn talked about, and build on them to achieve our mission to provide security to every working family in this country that is willing to work for it, so that everyone will be rewarded for what they do, and to help our people in the great struggles of daily life, to strengthen our families and give all of our kids a childhood, to make all of our streets safe and our environment clean. That is our struggle. And to do it we have to be willing to change the way the Government works, to earn the trust and the confidence of the American people and to make it work again for all. That is what I have been working on.

And for all those who would argue against your political preferences and these people in Congress, let me just remind you, think back to where we were 4 or 5 years ago when the deficit was more than twice as high as it is; when your unemployment rate was 2

points higher; when it seemed like the only new jobs that were coming into the economy were low-wage jobs. No, I don't pretend that we solved all the problems, but we do have over 8 million new jobs, just like I said; we have cut the deficit, just like I said; and wages are going up again in America for the first time in a decade. And that's something to run on.

The first argument, obviously, is the argument Senator Glenn made. The other side, they said if our economic plan passed it would bring a disaster to America. They were wrong. We don't need to go back to their strategies. They gave us the disaster for America the last time they had the economy. On the other hand, we don't need to stand pat, either, as they tried to do in 1992. This is a record to build on, not to stand on.

We have to meet the challenges of all those Americans out there who do not feel strong and certain about the future. They are basically three groups of Americans: They're the people that live in those inner-city neighborhoods and those isolated rural areas where nobody has invested money yet. We need to give people incentives, tax incentives to put their money there to create private sector jobs to grow the economy there. We need to put in banks to loan money to people there. If we can provide incentives to invest in foreign countries, we ought to provide incentives to invest in the heartland of America's neighborhood.

The second group of Americans are the Americans who are working harder and harder and harder at hourly wages and never seem to get a raise. And there are a lot of them. And what do we have to do with them? For one thing, we should do no harm; we should reject the other side's budget proposal that would actually reduce the family tax credit that is now providing tax relief to families with incomes under \$28,000.

The second thing we ought to do is raise the minimum wage. You know, both political parties in America and most politicians talk about family values. Well, that's a good thing to talk about, it's a good thing to be for. There's nothing more important. But there are millions of people out there, my fellow Americans, who are trying to raise children on \$4.25 an hour. You can't do that; that's

not a family value. We ought to raise it instead of letting it go to a 40-year low.

We ought to give these people the certainty that we are fighting for a growing economy and we're trying to open new markets. You know, we have concluded 200 trade agreements since I have been President, 20 with Japan. And in the areas where we've made new trade agreements, our exports have gone up by 80 percent with Japan. We've got to give these people a fair break and not let them be worked over in the global economy.

We ought to give these families a real tax break. And one of the things we ought to give them is a tax deduction for the cost of all education after high school—a college—[inaudible]—tax break.

We ought to say—and then there's a third group of people. You've been reading a lot about them lately. They're the people that work for these big corporations that are downsizing. What about them? Some of them are average income working people, some of them look like me—they're 50-year-old, white, gray-headed men who worked for these big companies for 25 or 30 years, and all of a sudden—says, "We don't need you anymore. I know you've got two kids about ready to go to college, I know you've got problems, but we're sorry, you have to go." What about them?

Well, you know what? There are several things that we can do. For one thing, we ought to say there are a lot of companies that don't do that to their employees; let's look at them and find out how they do it and give other companies incentives to treat their folks in a good, positive way.

Then we ought to say if a person loses their job in America, they ought to immediately get a voucher from the Federal Government worth about \$2,500 a year that they can take to the nearest community college to immediately go back and learn a new skill and start a new life. And if you lose your job or if someone in your family gets sick, we ought to change the law, we ought to do it now so that you don't lose your health insurance anymore and you can keep it when you lose your job.

And if you go to work for a small company, you still ought to be able to take out a pen-

sion plan that you don't lose even if you lose your job; people ought to be able to carry those pensions with them and keep them for a lifetime and protect themselves in their retirement.

My fellow Americans, we have to face the challenges of the future because everybody has to know that they can benefit from the new global economy. I am grateful for the 8.4 million jobs. I am grateful that we have set a new record in business formation every year I've been President. I'm glad we're number one in selling automobiles and semiconductors again. I'm glad that the World Economic Forum in Europe says that we've gone from fifth place before I became President to having the most productive economy in the world for the last 3 years; I'm glad about that. But I won't be satisfied until working together we have created the opportunity for every American who will work for it to make the most of his or her own life and to give all the kids in this country a better future, and you shouldn't be, either.

Let me say that a big part of that is also getting back to our basic values, to having our communities and our families stronger. We have to help people raise their kids. That's why I was for the family tax credit. This year, 17 million families with incomes of under \$28,000 a year will have lower taxes because of that '93 economic plan. That's why I was for the V-chip in the telecommunications bill so that parents would have more control over what their children see on television. I think that's important.

That's why our administration was the first in history to say we have to do something about the biggest health problem our young people face today, which is that 3,000 of them illegally start smoking every day and 1,000 of them will die sooner because of it, and we ought to stop it if we can. We've got to do something about it.

And we have to do something to make our streets safer. I'm glad that the crime rate is down and the welfare rolls are down and the food stamp rolls are down and the poverty rolls are down and the teen pregnancy rate is down. I'm glad about that, but they're all too high, and you know it. And we cannot be satisfied until you turn on the evening news at night and if you see on the evening

news that a terrible crime has been committed, you are surprised instead of numb to it. That's when we know we will have whipped the crime problem.

And so I say to you, we need a combination of things. First, let's do what we know works. The FOP, the Fraternal Order of Police, which has one of the biggest chapters in the country here in Ohio, and all of the other law enforcement officers in this country helped us write that crime bill that Congress tried to undo a couple of days ago. And we got with them and with people that work on crime in the community and they said, "What works? Community policing works; put more police on the streets, put them in the neighborhoods, put them in the school yards, let people know their neighbors. They can lower the crime rate." And, folks, all over America, in city after city where people had given up on crime, the murder rate is down and violence is down. We can do better. We have to do more of that.

We also said that we ought to have tougher laws for punishment for people who commit serious crimes. We ought to have a "three strikes and you're out" law. But for kids that get in trouble the first time, we need to try to give them a chance to recover their lives by giving them something to say yes to.

And let me tell you, again, it is a sign of the times: The crime rate is down, but the rate of violence among children under 18 is up. There are too many kids out there raising themselves and we need to support each other in giving them their childhood back. We have to do it.

There's been a lot of talk in Ohio about welfare reform. The welfare rolls are down since this administration came in. And even though Congress has not yet passed a welfare reform bill that I can sign that is tough on work but good to children, we have on our own given 37 States permission to get rid of Federal rules and find ways to move people from welfare to work. Three out of four people on welfare today are under welfare reform experiments approved by this administration. That is more than the last two administrations of the other party put together. We are moving people from welfare to work.

We are also doing something we should do more of. This administration has taken the

lead in giving America record amounts of child support collections. We can move people off welfare if parents pay what they owe to raise their own kids, and we should insist upon it.

If we want America to be what it ought to be, we also have to give our children clean air, clean water, safe food, and a decent environment for the future. For years there was a serious debate about that. There is no longer a serious debate, we now know we can grow the economy by protecting the environment, and that is what I mean to do.

And let me say to you, it is not necessary to balance the budget to shut down the clean-up of toxic waste sites. There are millions of children that live within 3 or 4 miles of toxic waste dumps. We don't need to shut down our efforts to clean them up. It is not necessary to balance the budget to weaken the laws on safe food and clean air and clean water. It is not necessary to undermine the enforcement of the environmental standards of America to balance the budget, and I will not do it. I will not tolerate it; it is wrong. It is wrong.

Now, my fellow Americans, we also have to realize that much as we'd like to, just because the cold war is over we can't walk away from the rest of the world. I know a lot of people even in this room have disagreed with some of the decisions I have made in foreign policy. But let me tell you, we are the world's only superpower now. I try not to meddle. There are some things we can't do. I don't want to be the world's policeman, but we can't walk away. We have to try to be the world's peacemaker. And every time we make peace, every time we make peace for people in other parts of the world we ensure that we will be a little safer.

Let me tell you, you know, if you just take terrorism, no great nation can hide from terrorism. We saw it at the World Trade Center in New York here. We saw it in Oklahoma City. And when you see bombs blow up innocent civilians in Israel or in London, just remember this: In the world we're living in, with computer technology, with open borders, one of our biggest challenges is seeing the people who are terrorists, the people who are drug runners, the people who are organized criminals, and the people who smuggle

weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons, coming together and working together. I am determined that that will not happen, and I intend to keep us involved with every freedom loving country in the world that will stand up to the terrorists and the thugs that would rob innocent people of their future.

Now, it is in that context that you must see this choice. I don't want to sit on this record. I want to build on it. I want more change, not less. I want a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic. We have given you the smallest Government, not the other party that always cursed the Federal Government. The Democrats have given you the smallest National Government in 30 years and the biggest reduction in regulations.

But I do believe—we need a doctor? Is there a doctor here? We have somebody who passed out in the heat here. Can we get a doctor? Okay? She's okay, just wanted more jokes. *[Laughter]* Let me say—we got another one over here. We need a doctor over there.

Now, let me say, you have to see this election in these terms. They can say, oh, old "Veto Bill." You bet, and I'm proud of it. And I'd do it again. You look—I want you to look at where the budget negotiations were when they left them to go finish their campaign. They had acknowledged that we didn't need those big Medicare cuts, those big Medicaid cuts; that we didn't have to gut education or environmental protection; that we didn't have to raise taxes on working people, we don't have to raid pension funds, we don't have to do those things.

Now, remember this, there is no longer a choice between the status quo and change. There are two real different views of change here. They say the Government is the problem, just get out of the way and let things take their course. I say, you remember what happened 100 years ago? The progressive movement that culminated in Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, that progressive movement started under a Republican, Teddy Roosevelt. They abandoned him and his tradition, and we shouldn't make the same mistake. We have to stand up for that.

I believe that the Government of the United States has to, first of all, make us secure; secondly, give us the conditions of a growing economy; and third, work in partnership with the American people so that individuals and families and communities can make the most of their own lives and meet the challenges of this uncertain world. That is the difference between our campaign and theirs. It is clear, unambiguous, and true.

So I want you to think about it. Yes, I vetoed that budget, and I'd do it again. But I don't like it. I'd rather sign the right kind of balanced budget that will lower interest rates, balance the budget, grow the economy, and give your kids a future. That's what I did. And that's the way I feel about welfare reform and health care reform and all these other things.

I want to work with the Congress. But the main thing I want is to give you the kind of future you need and deserve. So if you are willing to stand up and fight one more time, we can have an American dream for all Americans in the 21st century. That's what we can have. We can have family values. We can have a free and safe America. We can have a better future.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:23 p.m. in the Lausche Building at the Ohio State Fairgrounds. In his remarks, he referred to former Congressman Ted Strickland.

Remarks to the National Association of Attorneys General and an Exchange With Reporters *March 25, 1996*

The President. Please sit down, everybody. The Attorney General and I are delighted to be here. I understand that the Vice President has already been in this morning. Mr. Udall and Mr. Harshbarger and to all the Attorneys General here, you're very welcome in the White House and I'm very glad to see you.

I want to, if I might—I know we're going to have some time later for questions—but I wanted to just speak about two things this morning, especially while our friends in the

media are here, that directly affect the work that you do. First of all, I want to applaud those of you who have been in the forefront of dealing with the consequences of tobacco to young people in your States.

As you know, this administration has worked on that very hard. We promulgated the Synar regulation to try to help you do what you are trying to do in your States. And we will do everything we can to help you implement those Synar rules as easily and effectively as possible.

No matter how hard we work on that, I'm convinced that it won't be enough. Young people are barraged constantly by messages that glamour and grit can be found in a package of cigarettes. And we believe that we must act much more strongly to make cigarettes less accessible and to make children less subject to the lures of the advertising. And in that connection, I know that 27 of you wrote to the FDA in support of those objectives. I want to thank you for that. It seems to me that all the evidence clearly indicates that we have to continue to move on this front. It is the most serious public health problem that our young people face; 3,000 of them a day begin to smoke illegally, and 1,000 will have their lives shortened as a result.

The second thing I want to mention is to thank you for the partnership we've enjoyed in the fight to reduce crime and violence. The police program is continuing apace. We're actually slightly ahead of schedule in the goal of putting 100,000 more police officers on the street. There is now broad recognition in the country that the community policing strategy is central to the successful efforts that many, many communities have enjoyed in bringing down the crime rate. It's one of the good news stories of the United States in the last few years. And we will continue to do that.

We also have worked hard with you on a number of other areas in the crime bill. I want to mention, if I might, one other thing that's especially important, and that is the issue of gun violence. The Brady bill, which became the Brady law, has now directly resulted in over 60,000 people with criminal records being denied access to guns. And it is working well and I think it has proved be-

yond even some of us who supported it, even beyond our expectations, that it can make a difference.

As you know, we've had a recent controversy here in Washington with the attempt in the House of Representatives, which was successful in the House, to repeal the assault weapons ban. It is not presently scheduled for a vote in the Senate yet, but the people who got it voted on in the House certainly haven't given up, and there are a lot of people on record in support of repealing it in the Senate. So I ask you for your support on that. It would be a mistake. This country needs a lot of things, but it does not need more assault weapons.

And we now have been through one good set of hunting seasons in every State in America, and so every hunter who was told that that assault weapon ban represented some threat to his or her ability to go out and hunt deer in the deer seasons, or ducks in my home State, now knows that was not true.

And if it does get to my desk, of course I will veto it, and I'm confident the veto will be sustained. But this should not be brought back up. This should not even be a subject of debate in the United States. But it is still very much alive and well, and so I ask you for your help and your support in that regard.

We have got to continue to work on this crime problem until—everybody knows we will never totally eliminate crime in America; we can't transform human nature. But I do believe if we work at it we can get back to the time when people turn on the evening news and they see a horrible crime story, they're surprised instead of numb to it. And that is, I think, the goal we ought to set for ourselves, that it should become the exception rather than the rule.

And again—I know that I speak for the Attorney General—we have enjoyed working with all of you and we're glad to be here and we want to answer some of your questions. I think we'll have a chance to visit after we conclude the public portion of this meeting, but I thank you very much.

I asked the Attorney General if she wanted to give a speech. She said, no, you're coming to see her this afternoon. [Laughter]

Terry. [Terence Hunt, Associated Press]

China and Taiwan

Q. Mr. President, do you think that China and Taiwan are at a turning point now?

The President. Do you mean do I think the tensions are going down?

Q. Right, where do you think this is going?

The President. Well, I hope they are. I was encouraged by some statements that came out of both sides in the aftermath of the election. And so I hope that is what is going on.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:36 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Attorneys General Tom Udall of New Mexico and Scott Harshbarger of Massachusetts, president and president-elect, respectively, National Association of Attorneys General.

Executive Order 12996— Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System

March 25, 1996

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in furtherance of the purposes of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd), the Refuge Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 460k), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531), the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3901), the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401), the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321), and other pertinent statutes, and in order to conserve fish and wildlife and their habitat, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System ("Refuge System") is to preserve a national network of lands and waters for the conservation and management of fish, wildlife, and plant resources of the United States for the benefit of present and future generations.

Sec. 2. Guiding Principles. To help ensure a bright future for its treasured national her-

itage, I hereby affirm the following four guiding principles for the management and general public use of the Refuge System:

- (a) *Public Use.* The Refuge System provides important opportunities for compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation.
- (b) *Habitat.* Fish and wildlife will not prosper without high-quality habitat, and without fish and wildlife, traditional uses of refuges cannot be sustained. The Refuge System will continue to conserve and enhance the quality and diversity of fish and wildlife habitat within refuges.
- (c) *Partnerships.* America's sportsmen and women were the first partners who insisted on protecting valuable wildlife habitat within wildlife refuges. Conservation partnerships with other Federal agencies, State agencies, Tribes, organizations, industry, and the general public can make significant contributions to the growth and management of the Refuge System.
- (d) *Public Involvement.* The public should be given a full and open opportunity to participate in decisions regarding acquisition and management of our National Wildlife Refuges.

Sec. 3. Directives to the Secretary of the Interior. To the extent consistent with existing laws and interagency agreements, the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out his trustee and stewardship responsibilities for the Refuge System, is directed to:

- (a) recognize compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation as priority general public uses of the Refuge System through which the American public can develop an appreciation for fish and wildlife;
- (b) provide expanded opportunities for these priority public uses within the Refuge System when they are compatible and consistent with sound

principles of fish and wildlife management, and are otherwise in the public interest;

- (c) ensure that such priority public uses receive enhanced attention in planning and management within the Refuge System;
- (d) provide increased opportunities for families to experience wildlife-dependent recreation, particularly opportunities for parents and their children to safely engage in traditional outdoor activities, such as fishing and hunting;
- (e) ensure that the biological integrity and environmental health of the Refuge System is maintained for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans;
- (f) continue, consistent with existing laws and interagency agreements, authorized or permitted uses of units of the Refuge System by other Federal agencies, including those necessary to facilitate military preparedness;
- (g) plan and direct the continued growth of the Refuge System in a manner that is best designed to accomplish the mission of the Refuge System, to contribute to the conservation of the ecosystems of the United States, and to increase support for the Refuge System and participation from conservation partners and the public;
- (h) ensure timely and effective cooperation and collaboration with Federal agencies and State fish and wildlife agencies during the course of acquiring and managing National Wildlife Refuges;
- (i) ensure appropriate public involvement opportunities will be provided in conjunction with refuge planning and management activities; and
- (j) identify, prior to acquisition, existing compatible wildlife-dependent uses of new refuge lands that shall be permitted to continue on an interim basis pending completion of comprehensive planning.

Sec. 4. Judicial Review. This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity

by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 25, 1996.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
8:45 a.m., March 27, 1996]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on March 28.

**Executive Order 12995—
Amendment to Executive Order No.
12873**

March 25, 1996

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to assist paper mills in their procurement of recovered materials to use as raw materials, it is hereby ordered that Executive Order No. 12873 is amended as follows:

Section 1. Section 504(a) of Executive Order No. 12873 shall read: “(a) For high speed copier paper, offset paper, forms bond, computer printout paper, carbonless paper, file folders, white woven envelopes and for other uncoated printing and writing paper, such as writing and office paper, book paper, cotton fiber paper, and cover stock, the minimum content standard shall be no less than 20 percent postconsumer materials beginning December 31, 1994. This minimum content standard shall be increased to 30 percent beginning on December 31, 1998.”

Sec. 2. Section 504(b) of Executive Order No. 12873 shall be deleted and section 504(c) of that order shall be redesignated as section 504(b) and shall read: “(b) As an alternative to meeting the standards in section 504(a), for all printing and writing papers, the minimum content standard shall be no less than 50 percent recovered materials that are a waste material byproduct of a finished product other than a paper or textile product which would otherwise be disposed of in a landfill, as determined by the State in which the facility is located.”

Sec. 3. The last sentence of section 301(a) of Executive Order No. 12873 shall read “In

carrying out his or her functions, the Federal Environmental Executive shall consult with the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality.”

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 25, 1996.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
8:45 a.m., March 27, 1996]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 26, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on March 28.

**Statement on the Death of
Edmund Muskie**

March 26, 1996

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of former Senator Edmund Muskie. A dedicated legislator and caring public servant, Senator Muskie was a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family, his friends, and the people of Maine at this difficult time.

Message to the Congress on Angola

March 25, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Secu-

rity Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against Angola (UNITA). There have been no amendments to the Regulations since my report of September 18, 1995.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or

involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benguela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. The FAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including special fliers and computer bulletin board information initiated by FAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 18, 1995, through March 25, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Angola (UNITA) are reported to be about \$226,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 25, 1996.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 27.

Statement on Signing the Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996

March 26, 1996

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 2036, the "Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996," which brings needed reforms to the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA).

This Act would eliminate a statutory mandate that requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to promulgate stringent and costly treatment requirements for certain low-risk wastes that already are regulated under the Clean Water Act or Safe Drinking Water Act. The EPA considers these wastes to present little or no risk, due to existing regulation under State and Federal law.

The Act requires EPA to conduct a study to determine whether, following elimination of this mandate, there will be any risks that might not be addressed by State or other Federal laws. It also preserves EPA's authority to impose any additional controls that are needed to protect public health and the environment. In addition, H.R. 2036 reforms certain municipal landfill ground water monitoring requirements under current law, thereby easing burdens on local governments.

The Administration's support for H.R. 2036 originated in its initiative for Reinventing Environmental Regulation, as announced on March 16, 1995. As part of that initiative, I made a commitment to support common-sense reforms to the SWDA—if those reforms could be developed through a bipartisan process. This Act addresses one of the most important issues that the Administration identified in our initiative. Once implemented by EPA, it will eliminate an unnecessary and duplicative layer of costly regulation,

yielding tens of millions of dollars in savings to private industry.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 26, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 2036, approved March 26, was assigned Public Law No. 104-119. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 27.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Education Summit in Palisades, New York

March 27, 1996

Thank you very much, Governor Miller, Governor Thompson; Lou Gerstner. Thank you for hosting this terribly important event. To all of the Governors and distinguished guests, education leaders, and business leaders who are here, let me say that I am also delighted to be here with the Secretary of Education, Governor Dick Riley. I believe that he and Governor Hunt and Governor Branstad and I were actually there when the "Nation At Risk" report was issued, as well as when the education summit was held by President Bush. I want to thank Secretary Riley for the work that he has done with the States and with educators all across the country. And I know that every one of you has worked with him, but I'm glad to have him here, and he's been a wonderful partner for me and I think for you.

This is an extraordinary meeting of America's business leaders and America's Governors. I know some have raised some questions about it, but let me just say on the front end I think it is a very appropriate and a good thing to do, and I applaud those who organized it and those who have attended.

The Governors, after all, have primary, indeed constitutional responsibility for the conditions of our public schools. And the business leaders know well, perhaps better than any other single group in America, what the consequences of our failing to get the most out of our students and achieve real educational excellence will be for our Nation.

So I am very pleased to see you here doing this, and I want to thank each and every one

of you. I also think you have a better chance than perhaps anyone else, even in this season, to keep the question of education beyond partisanship and to deal with it as an American challenge that all the American people must meet and must meet together.

All of you know very well that this is a time of a dramatic transformation in the United States. I'm not sure if any of us fully understands the true implications of the changes through which we are all living and the responsibilities that those changes impose upon us. It is clear to most people that the dimensions of economic change now are the greatest that they have been since we moved from farm to factory and from rural areas to cities and towns 100 years ago.

In his book "The Road From Here" Bill Gates says that the digital chip is leading us to the greatest transformation in communications in 500 years, since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe. If that is true, it is obvious beyond anyone's ability to argue that the educational enterprise, which has always been central to the development of good citizens in America as well as to a strong economy, is now more important than ever before.

That means that we need a candid assessment of what is right and what is wrong with our educational system and what we need to do. Your focus on standards, your focus on assessment, your focus on technology is all to the good. We know that many of our schools do a very good job, but some of them don't. We know that many of our teachers are great, but some don't measure up. We know many of our communities are seizing the opportunities of the present and the future, but too many aren't.

And most important, we know that—after the emphasis on education which goes back at least until 1983 in the whole country and to my native region, to the South, to the late seventies when we began to try to catch up economically with the rest of the country—we know that while the schools and the students of this country are doing better than they were in 1984 and better than they were in 1983, when the "Nation At Risk" was issued and in 1989 when the education summit was held at Charlottesville, most of them still are not meeting the standards that are nec-

essary and adequate to the challenges of today. So that is really what we have to begin with.

Now America has some interesting challenges that I think are somewhat unique to our country in this global environment in which education is important, and we might as well just sort of put them out there on the front end, not that we can resolve them today.

The first is that we have a far more diverse group of students in terms of income and race and ethnicity and background and indeed living conditions than almost any other great country in the world.

Second, we have a system in which both authority and financing is more fractured than in other countries is typically the case.

Third, we know that our schools are burdened by social problems not of their making, which make the jobs of principals and teachers more difficult.

And fourth, and I think most important of all, our country still has an attitude problem about education that I think we should resolve, that is even prior to the standards and the assessment issue, and that is that too many people in the United States think that the primary determinant of success and learning is either IQ or family circumstances instead of effort. And I don't. And I don't think any of the research supports that.

So one of the things that I hope you will say is, in a positive way, that you believe all kids can learn and in a stronger way that you believe that effort is more important than IQ or income, given the right kind of educational opportunities, the right kind of expectations. It's often been said that Americans from time to time suffer from a revolution of rising expectations. This is one area where we need a revolution of rising expectations. We ought to all simply and forthrightly say that we believe that school is children's work and play, that it can be great joy, but that effort matters.

I see one of our business leaders here, this former State senator from Arkansas, Senator Joe Ford, whose father was the head of our educational program in Arkansas for a long time. We had a lot of people in one-room schoolhouses 40 and 50 and 60 years ago, reading simple readers, who believed that ef-

fort was more important than IQ or income. They didn't know what IQ was. And we have got to change that. And Governors, every Governor and every business leader in this country can make a difference.

I'm no Einstein, and not everybody can do everything, but if you stack this up from one to the other, all the Americans together in order by IQ, you couldn't stick a straw between one person and the next. And you know it as well as I do. Most people can learn everything they need to know to be good citizens and successful participants in the American economy and in the global economy. And I believe that unless you can convince your constituents that that is the truth, that all of your efforts to raise standards and all of your efforts to have accountability through tests and other assessments will not be as successful as they ought to be. And I think frankly, a lot of people, even in education, need to be reminded of that from time to time.

Now let's get back to the good news. Thirty or 40 years ago, maybe even 20 years ago, no one could ever have conceived of a meeting like this taking place. Governors played little role in education until just a couple of decades ago, and business didn't regard it as their responsibility. In the late seventies and the early eighties this whole wave began to sweep America. And one important, positive thing that ought never to be overlooked is that the business leadership of America and the Governors of this country have been literally obsessed with education for a long time now. And that's a very good thing, because one of the problems with America is that we tend to be in the grip of serial enthusiasms. It's the hula hoop today and something else tomorrow. Boy, that dates me, doesn't it? *[Laughter]*

In this country the Governors have displayed a remarkable consistency of commitment to education, and at least since 1983, the business community has displayed that commitment. And I think it's fair to say that all of us have learned some things as we have gone along, which is what has brought you to this point, that there is a—you understand now, and I've heard Lou Gerstner talk about it in his, almost his mantra about standards—that we understand that the next big step has to be to have some meaningful and appro-

priately high standards and then hold people accountable for them.

I think it's worth noting that the 1983 "Nation At Risk" report did do some good things. Almost every State in the country went back and revised its curriculum requirement. Many revised their class size requirements. Many did other things to upgrade teacher training or to increase college scholarships or to do a lot of other things.

In 1989 I was privileged to be in Charlottesville working with Governor Branstad and with Governor Campbell, primarily, as we were trying to get all the Governors together to develop the statement at the education summit with President Bush. And that was the first time there had ever been a bipartisan national consensus on educational goals.

The realization was in 1989 was that 6 years after a "Nation At Risk," all these extra requirements were being put into education, but nobody had focused on what the end game was. What did we want America to look like? It's worth saying that we wanted every child to show up for school ready to learn, that we wanted to be proficient in certain core courses and were willing to assess our students to see if we were, that we wanted to prepare our people for the world of work, that we wanted to be extra good in math and science and to overcome our past deficiencies. All the things that were in those educational goals were worth saying.

Another thing that the Charlottesville summit did that I think is really worth emphasizing is that it defined for the first time, from the Governors up, what the Federal role in education ought to be and what it should not be. I went back this morning, just on the way up, and I read the Charlottesville statement about what the Governors then unanimously voted that the Federal role should be and what it should not be.

When I became President and I asked Dick Riley to become Secretary of Education, I said that our legislative agenda ought to be consistent, completely consistent with what the Governors had said at Charlottesville. So, for example, the Governors said at Charlottesville, the Federal Government has a bigger responsibility to help people show up for school prepared to learn.

So we emphasized things like more funds for Head Start and more investment in trying to improve the immunization rates of kids and other health indicators; and more responsibility for access to higher education, so we tried to reform the student loan program and invest more money in Pell grants and national service and things like that; and then, more responsibility to give greater flexibility to the States in K through 12 and to try to promote reform without defining how any of this should be done.

And so that's what Goals 2000 was about. We tried to have a system in which States and mostly local school districts could pursue world-class standards based on their own plans for grassroots reform. And we overhauled the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as we redid title I to do one thing that I think is very important: We took out of what was then in the law for Chapter 1, which was lower educational expectations for poor children. It was an outrage, and we took it out of the law. I don't believe that poor children should be expected to perform at lower levels than other children.

And Dick Riley, since he has been Secretary of Education, has cut Federal regulations over States and local school districts by more than 50 percent. It seems to me that that is consistent with exactly what the Governors said at Charlottesville they wanted done.

Now the effort to have national standards, I think it's fair to say, has been less than successful. The history standards and the English standards effort did not succeed for reasons that have been well analyzed, although I'm not sure the debate was entirely worthless; I think the debate itself did some good.

But there are recommended standards that have been widely embraced, coming out of the math teachers, that most people think are quite good, and the preliminary indications for science are encouraging. And I want to say again, it would be wrong to say that there's been no progress since 1983. The number of young people taking core courses has jumped from 13 percent in '82 to 52 percent in '94. The national math and science scores are up a grade since 1983, half of all the 4-year-olds now attend preschool, 86 percent of all our young people are completing

high school. We're almost up to the 90 percent that was in the national education goals. That is progress.

But what we have learned since Charlottesville and what you are here to hammer home to America is that the overall levels of learning are not enough and that there are still significant barriers in various schools to meeting higher standards.

I accept your premise; we can only do better with tougher standards and better assessment, and you should set the standards. I believe that is absolutely right. And that will be the lasting legacy of this conference. I also believe, along with Mr. Gerstner and the others who are here, that it's very important not only for businesses to speak out for reform but for business leaders to be knowledgeable enough to know what reform to speak out for and what to emphasize and how to hammer home the case for higher standards, as well as how to help local school districts change some of the things that they are now doing so that they have a reasonable chance at meeting these standards.

Let me just go through now what I think we should do in challenging the country on standards for students, as well as for teachers and schools. I suppose that I have spent more time in classrooms than any previous President, partly because I was a Governor for 12 years and partly because I still do it with some frequency. I believe the most important thing you can do is to have high expectations for students—to make them believe they can learn, to tell them they're going to have to learn really difficult, challenging things, to assess whether they're learning or not, and to hold them accountable as well as to reward them.

Most children are very eager to learn. Those that aren't have probably been convinced they can't. We can do better with that. I believe that once you have high standards and high expectations, there is an unlimited number of things that can be done. But I also believe that there have to be consequences. I watched your panel last night, and I thought—the moment of levity on the panel was when Al Shanker was asked, when I was teaching school and I would give students homework, they said, "Does it count?" That's the thing I remember about the panel

last night. All of you remember, too. You laughed, right? [Laughter] "Does it count?" And the truth is that in the world we're living in today, "does it count" has to mean something, particularly in places where there haven't been any standards for a long time.

So if the States are going to go back and raise standards so that you're not only trying to increase the enrollment in core courses, you're trying to make the core courses themselves mean more. I heard Governor Hunt last night say he'd be willing to settle for reading and writing and math and science, I think were the ones you said.

Once you have to—if you're going to go back and define what's in those core courses and you're going to lift it up, you have to be willing, then, to hold the students accountable for whether they have achieved that or not. And again, another thing that Mr. Shanker said that I've always believed, we have always downgraded teaching to the test, but if you're going to know whether people learn what you expect them to know, then you have to test them on what you expect them to know.

So I believe that if you want the standards movement to work, first you have to do the hard work in deciding what it is you expect children to learn. But then you have to have an assessment system, however you design it, in your own best judgment at the State level, that says, no more social promotions, no more free passes. If you want people to learn, learning has to mean something. That's what I believe. I don't believe you can succeed unless you are prepared to have an assessment system with consequences.

In Arkansas in 1983 when we redid the educational standards, we had a very controversial requirement that young people pass the 8th grade tests to go on to high school. And not everybody passed it. And we let people take it more than once. I think it's fine to do that.

But even today, after 13 years, I think there are only five States in the country today which require a promotion for either grade to grade or school to school for its young people, to require tests for that. I believe that if you have meaningful standards that you have confidence in, that you believe if they're met your children will know what they need

to know, you shouldn't be afraid to find out if they're learning it, and you shouldn't be deterred by people saying this is cruel, this is unfair, or whatever they say.

The worst thing you can do is send people all the way through school with a diploma they can't read. And you're not being unfair to people if you give them more than one chance and if at the same time you improve the teaching and the operation of the schools in which they are. If you believe these kids can learn, you have to give them a chance to demonstrate it. This is only a cruel, short-sighted thing to do if you are convinced that there are limitations on what the American children can do. And I just don't believe that.

So that, I think, is the most important thing. I believe every State, if you're going to have meaningful standards, must require a test for children to move, let's say, from elementary to middle school or from middle school to high school or to have a full-meaning high school diploma. And I don't think they should measure just minimum competency. You should measure what you expect these standards to measure.

You know, when we instituted any kind of test at home, I was always criticized by the fact that the test wasn't hard enough. But I think it takes time to transform a system, and you may decide it takes time to transform a system. But you will never know whether your standards are being met unless you have some sort of measurement and have some sort of accountability. And while I believe they should be set by the States and the testing mechanism should be approved by the States, we shouldn't kid ourselves. Being promoted ought to mean more or less the same thing in Pasadena, California, that it does in Palisades, New York. In a global society, it ought to mean more or less the same thing.

I was always offended by the suggestion that the kids who grew up in the Mississippi Delta in Arkansas, which is the poorest place in America, shouldn't have access to the same learning opportunities that other people should and couldn't learn. I don't believe that.

So I think the idea—I heard the way Governor Engler characterized it last night, I thought was pretty good. You want a non-Federal, national mechanism to sort of share

this information so that you'll at least know how you're doing compared to one another. That's a good start. That's a good way to begin this. I also believe that we shouldn't ignore the progress that's been made by the goals panel, since Governor Romer was first leader of that going through Governor Engler, and by the National Assessment on Educational Progress. I know a lot of you talked about that last night. They've done a lot of good things, and we can learn a lot from them. We don't have to reinvent the wheel here.

I also would like to go back and emphasize something I heard Governor Hunt say last night. I think we should begin with a concrete standard for reading and writing because the most troubling thing to me is that we've been through a decade in which math and science scores have risen and reading scores have stayed flat. Intel recently had to turn away hundreds of applicants because they lacked basic reading and writing skills.

Now that will present you with an immediate problem because if you want to measure reading and writing, you will not be able just to have a multiple choice test which can be graded by a machine. You'll have to recognize that teachers do real work with kids when they teach them how to write, and you have to give them the time and support to do that. And then there has to be some way of evaluating that. I know that's harder and more expensive, but it really matters whether a child can read and write.

And for all the excitement about the computers in the schools—and I am a big proponent of it—I would note that when we started with a computer program in our school, and I believe when Governor Caperton started in West Virginia, he started in the early grades for the precise purpose that technology should be used first to give children the proper grounding in basic skills. So I think that's quite important.

Secretary Riley says that every child should be able to read independently by the end of the third grade. And parenthetically, that if that were the standard, I think we would be more successful in getting parents to read to their children every night, which would revolutionize the whole system of education anyway.

The second thing I think we have to do is to face the fact that if we want to have these standards for children, standards and tests, we have to have a system that rewards and inspires and demands higher standards of teachers. They, after all, do this work. The rest of us talk about it, and they do it.

So that means that first of all, you've got to get the most talented people in there. There's been a lot of talk about this for a decade now, but most States and school districts still need work on their certification rules. We should not bar qualified, even brilliant young people from becoming teachers. The Teach For America group in my home State did a wonderful job, and a lot of those young kids wind up staying and teaching, even though they can make 2 and 3 times as much money doing something else. Every State should, in my view, review that.

I also believe any time you're trying to hold teachers to higher standards they should be rewarded when they perform. I know that in South Carolina and Kentucky, if schools markedly improve their performance, they get bonuses and the teachers get the benefit. That's not a bad thing; that's a good thing, and we should have more of that.

I want to thank Governor Hunt for the work he's done on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. We had the first group of teachers who are board certified in the White House not very long ago. Every State should have a system, in my opinion, for encouraging these teachers to become board certified. The Federal Government doesn't have anything to do with that. Encourage these teachers to become board certified because they have to demonstrate not only knowledge but teaching skills. And when they achieve that level they should be rewarded. There should be extra rewards when they do that.

We also need a system that doesn't look the other way if a teacher is burned out or not performing up to standard. There ought to be a fair process for removing teachers who aren't competent, but the process also has to be much faster and far less costly than it is. I read the other day that in New York it can cost as much as \$200,000 to dismiss a teacher who is incompetent. In Glen Ellyn, Illinois, a school district spent \$70,000 to dis-

miss a high school math teacher who couldn't do basic algebra and let the students sleep in class. That is wrong. We should do more to reward good teachers; we should have a system that is fair to teachers but moves much more expeditiously and much more cheaply in holding teachers accountable.

So States and school systems and teachers unions need to be working together to make it tougher to get licensed and recertified, easier and less costly to get teachers who can't teach out of the classrooms, and clearly set rewards for teachers who are performing, especially if they become board certified or in some State-defined way prove themselves excellent.

The third thing I think we have to do is to hold schools accountable for results. We have known now for a long time—we have no excuses for not doing—we have known for a long time that the most important player in this drama besides the teachers and the students are the school principals, the building principals. And yet, still, not every State has a system for holding the school districts accountable for having good principals in all these schools and then giving the principals the authority they need to do the job, getting out of their way and holding them accountable, both on the up side and the down side. To me, that is still the most important thing. Every school I go into, I can stay there about 30 minutes and tell you pretty much what the principal has done to establish a school culture, an atmosphere of learning, a system of accountability, a spirit of adventure. You can just feel it, and it's still the most important thing.

Secondly, the business community can do a lot of work with the Governors to help these school districts reinvent their budgets, I think. There are still too many school districts spending way too much money on administration and too little money on education and instruction. And there needs to be some real effort put into that, that goes beyond rhetoric. I mean, I was given these statistics, which I assume are true because I had it vetted four different times—I hate to use numbers that I haven't—if it is true that New York City spends \$8,000 a student on education, but only \$44 goes to books and other classroom materials, that's a disgrace.

That's wrong. And that's true in a lot of other school districts.

We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now. That's an area where I think the business community can make a major, major contribution. A lot of you have had to restructure your own operations; a lot of you have had to achieve far higher levels of productivity. If we can reduce the Federal Government by 200,000 people without undermining our essential mission, we can do a much better job in the school districts of the country.

Let me also say I think that we ought to encourage every State to do what most States are now doing, which is to provide more options for parents. You know, the terms of the public school choice legislation and the charter schools—a lot of you have done a very good job with the charter schools. But I'm excited about the idea that educators and parents get to actually start schools, create and manage them, and stay open only if they do a good job within the public school system. Every charter school I visited was an exciting place. Today, 21 of you allow charter schools. There are over 250 schools which are open; 100 more are going to open next year. Freed up from regulation and top-down bureaucracy, focusing on meeting higher standards, the schools have to be able to meet these standards if you impose them.

Secretary Riley has helped 11 States to start new schools, and in the balanced budget plan I submitted to Congress last week, there is \$40 million in seed money to help start 3,000 more charter schools over the next 5 years, which would be a tenfold increase. That may become the order of the day. So I believe we need standards and accountability for students, for teachers, and for schools.

Let me just mention two other things briefly. I don't believe you can possibly minimize—and a lot of the Governors I know have been in these schools—you cannot minimize how irrelevant this discussion would seem to a teacher who doesn't feel safe walking the halls of his or her school or how utterly hopeless it seems to students who have to look over their shoulders when they're walking to and from school. So I believe that we have to work together to continue to

make our schools safe and our students held to a reasonable standard of conduct, as well.

You know, we had a teacher in Washington last week who was mugged in a hallway by a gang of intruders, not students, a gang of intruders who were doing drugs and didn't even belong on the school grounds. We have got to keep working on that. All the Federal Government can do is give resources and pass laws. That's another thing the business community can help with, district after district. This entire discussion we have had is completely academic unless there is a safe and a disciplined and a drug-free environment in these schools.

We passed the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, the Gun-Free Schools Act. We supported random drug testing in schools. We have supported the character education movement. We've almost ended lawsuits over religious issues by the guidelines that Secretary Riley and the Attorney General issued, showing that our schools don't have to be religion-free zones. We have worked very hard to help our schools do their job here.

The next thing I hope we can do, all of us, in this regard is to work to help our schools stay open longer. Our budget contains \$14 million for helping people set up these community schools to stay open longer hours. But remember that 3 in the afternoon to 6 in the evening are the peak hours for juvenile crime, and all that comes back into the schools. So I think that's another thing we really need to look at. A lot of these schools do not have the resources today to stay open longer hours, but they would if they could.

And one of the primary targets I would have if I were a local leader trying to redo my district school budget is to reduce the amount spent on administration so that I could invest more money in keeping it open longer hours, especially for the latch-key kids and the other kids that are in trouble that don't have any other place to go. So that's something that I think is very important.

Finally, let me just echo what Governor Miller said about the technology. We did have a barnraising in California, and we hooked up actually more than 20 percent of the classrooms to the Internet on a single day. But we need every classroom and every

library in every school in America hooked up to the Internet as quickly as possible. We set a goal as the year 2000; we could actually get there more quickly. I propose that in the budget, a \$2 billion fund to help the communities who don't have the money to meet the challenge, but every community, every State in America, at least, has a high-tech community that could help get this done.

The Congress passed a very fine Telecommunications Act that I signed not very long ago which gives preferential treatment to people in isolated rural areas or inner-city areas for access to schools and hospitals. So the infrastructure, the framework is there.

Anything you can do to help do that, I think is good if the educators use the technology in the proper way. And I'll just close with this example. I was in the Union City School District in New Jersey not very long ago. That school district was about to be closed under the State of New Jersey's school bankruptcy law, which I think, by the way, is very good, holding school districts accountable, and they can actually lose their ability to operate as an independent district in New Jersey and the State takes them over if they keep failing.

There are a lot of first-generation immigrant children in that school. It was basically a poor school. Bell Atlantic went in and worked with others. They put computers in all the classrooms. They also put computer outlets in the homes of a lot of these parents. And you had—I talked to a man who came here from El Salvador 10 years ago who is now E-mailing his child's principal and teacher to figure out how the kid's doing.

But the bottom line is the dropout rate is now below the State average, and the test scores are above the State average in an immigrant district of poor children, partly because of the technology and partly because the business community said, "Hey, you kids are important," and partly because the place has a good principal and good teachers.

But I do think that the business community—if you look at the technology as an instrument to achieve your higher standards and to infuse high expectations into the community and to give the kids the confidence they need that they can learn, then this technology issue is a very important one.

Well, that's what I hope we'll do. I think we ought to have the standards. You should set them. We'll support you however you want. But they won't work unless you're going to really see whether the standards are being met and unless there are consequences to those who meet and to those who do not. I think you have to reward the good teachers and get more good people in teaching and that we have to facilitate the removal of those who aren't performing.

I think the schools need more authority and should be held more accountable. We've got to redo these central school budgets until we have squeezed down the overhead costs and put it back into education. And unless we have an environment in which there is safety and discipline, we won't succeed. And if we do have an environment in which the business community brings in more technology, we will succeed more quickly.

I believe that this meeting will prove historic. And again, let me say, I thank the Governors and the business leaders who brought it about. In 1983 we said, "We've got a problem in our schools. We need to take tougher courses. We need to have other reforms." In 1989 we said, "We need to know where we're going. We need goals." Here in 1996, you're saying you can have all of the goals in the world, but unless somebody really has meaningful standards and a system of measuring whether you meet those standards, you won't achieve your goals. That is the enduring gift you have given to America's schoolchildren and to America's future.

The Governors have to lead the way, the business community has to stay involved. Don't let anybody deter you and say you shouldn't be doing it. You can go back home and reach out to all the other people in the community because, in the end, what the teachers and the principals and more importantly even what the parents and the children do is what really counts. But we can get there together. We have to start now with what you're trying to do. We have to have high standards and high accountability. If you can

achieve that, you have given a great gift to the future of this country.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. in the Watson Room at the IBM Conference Center. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada, NGA vice chairman; Gov. Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin, NGA chairman; Louis Gerstner, chief executive officer, IBM; Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., of North Carolina; Gov. Terry E. Branstad of Iowa; Gov. Carroll W. Campbell of South Carolina; Gov. Tom Carper of Delaware; Gov. Gaston Caperton of West Virginia; Gov. John Engler of Michigan; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; and Albert Shanker, president, American Federation of Teachers.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Radiation Control for Health and Safety

March 27, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360qq) (previously section 360D of the Public Health Service Act), I am submitting the report of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 during calendar year 1994.

The report recommends the repeal of section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that requires the completion of this annual report. All the information found in this report is available to the Congress on a more immediate basis through the Center for Devices and Radiological Health technical reports, the Radiological Health Bulletin, and other publicly available sources. The Agency resources devoted to the preparation of this report could be put to other, better uses.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 27, 1996.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Report on the
Trade Agreements Program**

March 27, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1996 Trade Policy Agenda and 1995 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 27, 1996.

**Proclamation 6874—Death of
Edmund Sixtus Muskie**

March 27, 1996

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

As a mark of respect for the memory of Edmund Sixtus Muskie, one of our Nation's foremost public servants, I hereby order, by the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America by section 175 of title 36 of the United States Code, that the flag of the United States shall be flown at half-staff upon all public buildings and grounds, at all military posts and naval stations, and on all naval vessels of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions on Saturday, March 30, 1996. I also direct that the flag shall be flown at half-staff on that day at all United States embassies, legations, consular offices, and other facilities abroad, including all military facilities and naval vessels and stations.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-seventh day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., March 29, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 28, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 1.

**Remarks Announcing the “One
Strike and You’re Out” Initiative in
Public Housing**

March 28, 1996

Thank you. You know, when we were walking over here, Leora said she was nervous. I don't think she told the truth. [Laughter] I'm just glad she's not on the ballot this year. [Laughter] Didn't she do a great? I want to thank Leora Robinson and Lieutenant Ramirez. They both spoke so well and so passionately, and they spoke the truth. They spoke on behalf of the mayors, the police chiefs, the housing administrators, and the residents who are here and people all across America. And I thank them.

I thank the Members of Congress who are here; and Mr. McGaw, the head of the ATF; and my friends the mayors who are here, and especially—I know the mayor of Toledo is a proud mayor today, hearing these two fine people speak. I thank the Vice President for the work that he has done in our whole community empowerment initiative, trying to give people all over America control of their lives again. And I want to echo what the Vice President said; it is literally an inspiration for me to have the opportunity to work with Henry Cisneros, a man who believes that all problems can be solved and goes about proving it day-in and day-out. I thank you, sir, for what you have done.

In my State of the Union Address I challenged local housing authorities and tenant associations to adopt this “one strike and you're out” policy to restore the rule of law to public housing, to simply say, “If you mess up your community, you have to turn in your key. If you insist on abusing or intimidating or hurting other people, you'll have to live somewhere else.”

It seems so simple, it's hard to imagine how we ever went so wrong. Public housing was created with a simple purpose in mind, to provide good, inexpensive homes for good, hard-working people, so they could care for their children, hold down their jobs, and

eventually save enough, if they chose, to move into homes of their own. Public housing has never been a right; it has always been a privilege. And it is amazing how far some people in some places have strayed from that original mission.

I think it is worth saying today again, even though you have just seen evidence of it, most people who live in public housing work. Most people who live in public housing are doing their very best to be good parents. Most people who live in public housing deserve a better deal than they have gotten in the past from the kinds of things that have gone on. And we are determined to help the people all across this country change that so that everybody will be able to tell the story that Leora and Lieutenant Ramirez told today.

The only people who deserve to live in public housing are those who live responsibly there and those who honor the rule of law. We've worked hard to protect public housing residents with Operation Safe Home and public housing drug elimination programs. We've made 6,800 arrests, seized hundreds of weapons, confiscated \$3 million worth of illegal drugs. And coupled with our other anticrime initiatives, we're helping to restore order in our cities, to our one-stoplight towns, and in our public housing. But we know we have to do more.

This policy today is a clear signal to drug dealers and to gangs: If you break the law, you no longer have a home in public housing, "one strike and you're out." That should be the law everywhere in America.

To implement this rule, we are taking two steps. First, I will direct Secretary Cisneros to issue guidelines to public housing and law enforcement officials to spell out with unmistakable clarity how to enforce "one strike and you're out." These guidelines are essential.

Believe it or not, the Federal law has actually authorized "one strike" eviction since 1988. But many public housing authorities have not fully understood the scope of their legal authority. Others have problems working with residents or local police or the courts. And for a small number, enforcement has frankly not been a priority. For whatever reason, the sad fact is that in most places in this country, "one strike" has not been car-

ried out. You see the consequences when it is in what these fine people have said today.

Now there will be no more excuses, for these national guidelines tell public housing authorities the steps they must take to evict drug dealers and other criminals. They explain how housing authorities must work with tenants, with the police, with the courts, with our Government to get the job done. They also tell housing authorities how to screen tenants for criminal records. With effective screening, many of the bad people we're trying hard to remove today won't get into public housing in the first place.

The second thing we're going to do is to make sure these guidelines don't sit around and gather dust. Under the new rules HUD will propose, for the first time there will actually be penalties for housing projects that do not fight crime and enforce "one strike and you're out." Superior housing authorities that live up to their responsibilities will improve their chances for increased funding and for greater flexibility in how the housing authority is run by the local people. Those that don't will face increased supervision and might lose out on extra financial help.

I know that for some, "one strike and you're out" sounds like hardball. Well, it is. It is because it's morally wrong for criminals to use up homes that could make a big difference in the lives of decent families. And as Leora said better than I could have, if people aren't going to do anything wrong in public housing, they have nothing to fear from "one strike and you're out."

After all, it's not as if nobody wants to live there. There are three people in line for every one person who has a slot in public housing. In many places, the waiting list today is up to 4 years. This is a privilege, not a right. The people who are living there deserve to be protected, and the good people who want to live in public housing deserve to have a chance. The people who are in the middle, doing the wrong thing, must be removed.

There is no reason in the world to put the rights of a criminal before those of a child who wants to grow up safe or a parent who wants to raise that child in an environment where the child is safe, in no danger of being

shot down in a gang war, and can't be stolen away by drug addiction.

We know this policy works. Beyond Toledo, we know that in North Carolina at the Greensboro Housing Authority, where this policy has been implemented, crime is down 55 percent. We know that in Georgia at the Macon Housing Authority, drug-related arrests have fallen 91 percent since the policy was implemented in 1989. In both of those cities and in other cities all across the country where "one strike" has been implemented, one statistic is rising, the number of residents who feel safe.

We also know why "one strike" works, because for it to work, people have to join together in common cause. The Leora Robinsons have to support the Lieutenant Ramirezes. People have to work together to believe that they can recreate a community. When we tell you how to evict a drug dealer, therefore, you have to take the action. The guidelines only point the way. We'll make sure that our police have the tools they need to get crime out of public housing. But the residents, the administrators, the neighbors, the people that know that they can recreate a sense of community and security and a decent environment for children, they have to support the police in taking that action.

We can work for better housing in Washington, but only you, those of you who are here and your counterparts all across America, can make better housing and safer housing a reality where you live.

For too many years, the chaos in some of our public housing units has been a national blind spot and a national disgrace. Most Americans probably think it has to be that way. Many of them who had had no personal experience with tenants may even believe most people who live in public housing are lawless, are not working, are not concerned parents. All of that is wrong.

Now we are going to give the good, decent, law-abiding citizens in public housing the life they deserve, and we're going to give the kids the future they deserve by doing what we should have been doing all along, and doing it together.

I want every American to believe that if he or she works hard and plays by the rules, they can share in the American dream. I want

every parent to believe that if he or she works hard, they can do a better job raising their kids in a country that's supporting them, not undermining them. I want this country to come together across the lines of income and race, not be divided. Surely, our dreams of opportunity and decent childhoods and strong families and unity in this country can be furthered by what we're doing here today. And surely, others will see this and say that they have to do the same.

I want to now sign this Executive order, and I'd like to invite the people who are here from Greensboro and from Macon to come up as well: Deborah Shaw and Deputy Chief David Williams from the Greensboro Housing Authority, and Joann Fowler and Sergeant Richard Kory of the Macon Housing Authority. And I'd like to ask Lieutenant Ramirez and Leora to come up here and also be here when we sign.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:32 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Leora Robinson, resident of Ravine Park Village, Toledo, OH; and Lt. Frank Ramirez of the Toledo Police Department. Following his remarks, the President signed a memorandum for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on the "One Strike and You're Out" guidelines.

Memorandum on the "One Strike and You're Out" Guidelines

March 28, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Subject: One Strike and You're Out Guidelines

Since 1993, my Administration has undertaken comprehensive efforts to improve the safety and quality of life in our Nation's public housing. Operation Safe Home, the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, and steps to keep out weapons have been important parts of this overall safety effort. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has enabled cities to demolish dozens of blighted, high-rise projects and replace them with safer developments. The Department is also changing the social dynamic in public housing by instilling positive

incentives for personal responsibility and family self-sufficiency. In all of these initiatives, HUD has worked closely with the Congress and with public housing managers and residents, elected officials, and Federal and local law enforcement agencies.

Today, the majority of the Nation's approximately 3,400 public housing authorities provide safe, attractive, quality homes. But there remains too much public housing in this country that is ravaged by drugs, crime, and violence.

It is imperative that we protect the ability of all individuals to live in safety and free from fear, intimidation, and abuse. It is also imperative that our precious public housing resources be made available only to responsible, law-abiding individuals. We must have zero tolerance for those who threaten the safety and well-being of decent families and innocent children who live in public housing.

That is why, in my State of the Union Address, I expressed my strong support for a clear and straightforward rule for those who endanger public housing communities by dealing drugs or engaging in other criminal activity: One Strike and You're Out of public housing.

At my request, HUD has now developed, in consultation with the Department of Justice, new national Guidelines on One Strike and You're Out. These new Guidelines set forth how each public housing authority should use applicant screening and tenant eviction procedures to keep out drug dealers and other criminals who threaten the safety and the well-being of residents. These Guidelines are meant to ensure that One Strike and You're Out is effective and that it is fair.

You have advised me that HUD intends to amend its public housing performance evaluation regulations so that the overall "grade" HUD gives annually to each local housing authority will be based, in part, on how effectively it has implemented the type of applicant screening and tenant eviction policies set forth in the new Guidelines. I understand that this "grade" can affect both the amount of Federal funding a public housing authority receives and the degree of Federal oversight to which a public housing authority will be subject.

I hereby direct you to disseminate these important new Guidelines on One Strike and You're Out to each of this Nation's public housing authorities. I also direct you to ensure that these Guidelines are made available to public housing residents, Federal and local law enforcement agencies, community leaders, and appropriate elected officials.

One Strike and You're Out is one component of comprehensive initiatives already underway to improve safety and quality of life in public housing. We will continue to work with the Congress, and with public housing authorities, residents, local officials, and law enforcement agencies, to rid our public housing of drugs, violence, and crime.

William J. Clinton

Statement on Senate Action on the Line-Item Veto

March 28, 1996

I want to commend the Senate for passing legislation to give the President line-item veto authority. While not a perfect bill, the conference report as passed by the Senate will give Presidents the ability to cut wasteful Government spending and special interest tax provisions.

I have advocated the line-item veto for a very long time. I had the line-item veto when I was Governor of Arkansas; I advocated the line-item veto when I ran for President; and I have pursued it since becoming President.

The President, no matter what party, needs the line-item veto to ensure that our public resources are put to the best possible uses during these times of tight budgets. While I note that this authority does not become effective until the next Congress, I urge the House to follow the Senate's lead and pass the conference report now.

Statement on Congressional Inaction on Minimum Wage Legislation

March 28, 1996

I am disappointed that the Republican leadership has again prevented the Congress from even voting on whether to raise the minimum wage and give 10 million Ameri-

cans an immediate pay increase. With every day that the Republican leadership continues to stall, the value of the minimum wage continues to fall closer and closer to a 40-year low. Some of America's greatest working heroes are the parents who are trying to raise their kids, working full time at the minimum wage. If we value work and we value families, we ought to raise the value of the minimum wage. With the 5-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase next Monday, now is the time to put politics aside, raise the minimum wage, and help lift the lives of millions of America's workers.

Remarks on Signing the Cancer Control Month Proclamation

March 29, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, we're going to have a ceremony over in the East Room in just a few moments, so I don't want to make my remarks twice. Let me just say that there is hardly a family in America who has not been touched by cancer. We have come a very, very long way in the fight against cancer. More people are survivors than ever before; more people are living longer than ever before. But we have a great deal more to do before we can be confident that we have actually done everything possible to give our children and our grandchildren the kind of future they deserve.

And that's what this day is about. And that's what this proclamation declaring April Cancer Control Month is all about. And I'm glad to sign it, especially with these children behind me because they are the embodiment of our common endeavors.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:34 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Proclamation 6875—Cancer Control Month, 1996

March 29, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Research and the prompt application of research results have proved to be the strongest weapons we have against cancer. And we are making great strides in the study of this deadly disease. Indeed, the understanding of the processes by which a normal cell is transformed into a cancer cell is one of the great achievements of cancer research. Genetic studies are leading to better understanding of many cancers and improving our ability to intervene and stop their spread. While the implications of some findings are still unclear, we know that further progress hinges on continued scientific inquiry, and we understand that basic research must remain a national priority. In addition, all of us can act on information already at hand to make lifestyle choices that reduce the risk of developing cancer.

Smoking is the leading cause of preventable death in the United States and contributed to nearly one-third of all cancer deaths in our Nation last year. In addition to causing 400,000 deaths, smoking left others living with cancer, respiratory illness, heart disease, and other illnesses. Despite the clear link between smoking and these illnesses and deaths, each day 3,000 young Americans begin to smoke—a habit that will shorten the lives of 1,000 of them. We must address this problem. That is why the Food and Drug Administration proposed ways to limit young people's access to tobacco, as well as ways to limit the advertising that is so appealing to our youth. That is also why this Administration published the Synar regulation—to ensure that States have and enforce laws prohibiting sales of tobacco to young people.

Scientific evidence has also led to an increased understanding of the links between the foods we eat and certain types of cancer.

By reducing dietary fat, increasing fiber intake, consuming a variety of fruits and vegetables, and avoiding obesity, every American can take steps to reduce the risk of cancer. The National Cancer Institute, in collaboration with the food industry, sponsors "5 A Day For Better Health," a national program that encourages people to eat five or more servings of fruits and vegetables daily. And researchers continue to investigate nutrition programs that may have the potential to prevent cancer.

Mammography is another resource that can make a vital contribution to cancer control efforts, helping doctors detect breast tumors at an early, more treatable stage. Indeed, 93 percent of all women diagnosed with early breast cancer this year will live 5 years or longer. Recognizing the importance of this diagnostic tool, third-party reimbursement for mammograms is on the rise, and Medicare covers most of the cost of screening mammography for women over the age of 65. I encourage State governments, insurance providers, medical facilities, and employers to develop policies that improve women's access to this life-saving, affordable procedure.

In another step forward, the Food and Drug Administration has proposed changing its review process for new cancer therapies. This new approach will shorten development time by several years, and the FDA is also cutting its own review time in half—from a year to about 6 months. All of these changes mean new therapies will be available sooner and will be accessible to more of our Nation's cancer patients. The FDA's initiative could immediately affect at least 100 drugs now being studied—with dozens of them getting to the market sooner—and improve the lives of millions of Americans who can take advantage of those therapies.

To publicize these advances and options, the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Information Service helps patients, health professionals, and the public in all 50 States and Puerto Rico. Toll-free telephone service provides accurate, up-to-date information about prevention and detection methods, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and research. In addition, the CIS' outreach system has developed partnerships with other cancer organi-

zations and Federal, State, and local health agencies to promote cancer education initiatives aimed at medically underserved and other special populations.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the National Cancer Act, which expanded and intensified America's efforts to stop cancer. We can take pride in the gains that have been made toward this goal during the past quarter-century, but we must also remember the essential work that remains. As we observe Cancer Control Month, let us renew and strengthen our abiding commitment to controlling and eliminating this disease so that our children and grandchildren can lead longer, healthier lives.

In 1938, the Congress of the United States passed a joint resolution requesting the President to issue an annual proclamation declaring April as "Cancer Control Month."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim April 1996, as Cancer Control Month. I invite the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, and the appropriate officials of all other areas under the American Flag to issue similar proclamations. I also call upon health care professionals, private industry, community groups, insurance companies, and all interested organizations and individuals to unite in support of our Nation's determined efforts to control cancer.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-ninth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:54 a.m., April 1, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 2.

Remarks on the Anticancer Initiative March 29, 1996

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Shalala, Dr. Kessler, Congressman Richardson, welcome.

To all of you who are here, I welcome you, and I thank you, each in your own way, for the power of your example.

I thank Stacy, too, especially for being here and telling us her story and doing it in the way that she did. We know we can thank modern medicine, but you saw a little bit of her steel and grit when she was talking, and it's a great testimony to her faith and to her inner strength. I think that we ought to ask her parents to stand since she mentioned them.

Would you stand up, please, Mr. and Mrs. Oller? Thank you. *[Applause]* Thank you very much.

Perhaps more than any other health statistic in America, cancer touches virtually every family. My mother and my stepfather succumbed to cancer; the Vice President lost his sister. Just before coming here today I proclaimed April Cancer Control Month over in the Oval Office, and I was there with several cancer patients and their families. They're all over here, and I want to thank all of them for coming to visit with me, the children and the adults alike, the parents, the brothers, the sisters. As families, they are fighting for a way to win this battle, and the rest of us owe it to them to give them every chance they can to win. That's why we're here today; we want to have more people like Stacy.

More than ever before, we know from the sheer statistics that cancer is treatable and beatable. We know that early detection and prevention are critical. We have, therefore, put more resources in to mammograms for women over 50, and we have taken a very strong stand against the use of tobacco by young people and against any attempt to induce them to use it.

When cancer does strike, we have an ever-growing arsenal of new drugs and cutting-edge therapies to fight it. But before any treatment can get to patients, we need to make sure it is safe and effective. The development and approval process can take years. When a member of a family gets cancer, the whole family bears the pain and years are sometimes far, far too long. These families should not also suffer from the stress of knowing that there may be better remedies

already out there, but they're somehow not quite available.

So I'm happy today to say to those patients and to their families, the waiting is over. Today, we announce a major new initiative to speed new cancer therapies to our people. These changes will affect at least 100 drugs now being studied. Dozens of them will get to the market sooner, and that means they can help Americans suffering from cancers of the breast, lung, ovary, prostate, and colon, among others. For these Americans, we cannot guarantee miracles, but at least now new hope is on the way.

With our reforms, cancer patients won't have to leave the country to look for promising treatments. If a drug does demonstrate effectiveness, patients will have access to it here even while the drug continues to undergo tests for approval. Let me emphasize, these steps will speed cancer drugs to patients who need them when they need them. They will help to save lives. They will give cancer patients a better chance. They will do all this by cutting redtape, but they will not—they will not—cut corners on safety. We are doing this the right way, and it is the right thing to do.

This initiative is part of our National Performance Review, popularly known as REGO, reinventing Government. This remarkable effort has been chaired brilliantly by the Vice President, and it will, among other things, now cut the development time for drugs by as much as several years. At the same time, the FDA will cut its review time for these drugs from 12 months to 6 months.

The initiative contains four major proposals:

First, we propose to accelerate approval for cancer drugs by allowing companies to apply to market a treatment that is still being tested. In other words, if a drug shows promise by shrinking tumors, for example, it can be considered for approval. That could cut several years off the time needed to get a drug to market.

Second, we propose to expand access to drugs that are already approved in other countries. The FDA will encourage the sponsors of these experimental drugs to apply for permission to distribute the drug to eligible

cancer patients before final drug approval is granted here in the United States.

Third, we propose that cancer patients be better represented in FDA advisory meetings. These committees play a major role in policy and product decisions. And cancer patients who have valuable insights and the most at stake should be at the table when these decisions are made.

Fourth, we propose fewer applications for additional uses of approved cancer drugs. Often, these applications are for uses the drug maker does not even intend to market. By cutting out these unnecessary applications, we will free investigators from paperwork and allow them to devote more time to cancer research.

These four steps are the results of listening to patients, to their families, to their advocates, to the pharmaceutical industry, the doctors, and the researchers. This initiative shows what we can do when we work together.

Since 1938, our Nation has looked to the FDA to protect and improve the public health by making sure that medicines we take help us, not harm us. Our commitment to safety must never waver. Under Commissioner David Kessler, the FDA has reinforced that commitment while working to speed drug approval in the right way. In 1987 it took an average of 33 months to approve new drug applications. In 1994 96 percent of new drug applications were acted on within 12 months.

On AIDS drugs the United States was the first to approve five of the six antiviral treatments for the disease. The most recent of these drugs was approved in 42 days, a record. And the FDA has been the first to approve new drugs for ovarian cancer, for lymphocytic leukemia, for cystic fibrosis, for multiple sclerosis, for Lou Gehrig's disease and Alzheimer's. Under Dr. Kessler, more than ever, the FDA is a place where advance science and common sense work together for the American people.

Now using the principles of the National Performance Review, we have an opportunity to help more Americans conquer cancer. These four steps will make a big difference, and we are glad to give them to the American people today.

Now I'd like to ask the Vice President to come up here and talk just a few moments about the reinventing of these regulations, how we did it, what we hope will happen. And let me say, again, how grateful I am to Secretary Shalala, to Dr. David Kessler, and to the Vice President, and to all the other good people at FDA. We can keep our people safe and save more lives, and that's exactly what we're determined to do.

Thank you, God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:06 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Stacy Oller, who introduced the President.

Proclamation 6876—Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A., 1996

March 29, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In looking forward to the 21st century, we recognize that excellence in education is the key to our Nation's future. At a time when we face difficult choices about how best to strengthen that future, our commitment to meaningful education for our youth must remain absolutely firm—we have a profound obligation to put children's needs first and to make the essential investments that will help them succeed.

Throughout his distinguished life, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson was an advocate for the high-quality education and strong values young people need to become productive and caring citizens. Drawing on a deep tradition of faith and a dedication to strengthening family and community ties, the Lubavitcher Rebbe sought to help our youth become responsible leaders and moral thinkers.

On this day and throughout the year, let us join parents, teachers, and concerned people everywhere who are following Rabbi Schneerson's example by empowering young people with essential skills and knowledge. By nurturing their minds and spirits together, we can help our children to embrace all of the exciting challenges ahead.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim March 31, 1996, as Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A. I call upon educators, volunteers, and all the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-ninth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:55 a.m., April 1, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 2.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 23

In the morning, the President traveled to Cincinnati, OH, and in the afternoon, he traveled to Columbus. In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

March 25

The President announced his intention to nominate Raymond W. Kelly to be Under Secretary for Enforcement at the Department of the Treasury.

The President announced his intention to nominate David C. Halsted as Ambassador to Chad, Tibor Nagy, Jr., as Ambassador to Guinea, Charles O. Cecil as Ambassador to Niger, and Wendy Jean Chamberlin as Ambassador to Laos.

March 27

In the morning, the President traveled to Palisades, NY. In the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to appoint Nancy J. Bloch, Carl G. Lewis, and James J. Weisman to the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint Nicholas C. Burckel to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint Mady Wechsler Segal and Carroll W. Conn, Jr., to the U.S. Military Academy Board of Visitors.

March 28

The President announced his intention to nominate Johnny H. Hayes as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

March 29

In the afternoon, the President met with President Suleyman Demirel of Turkey in the Oval Office.

The White House announced that the President will visit the Republic of Korea on April 16.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted March 25

James E. Hall, of Tennessee, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of 2 years (reappointment).

Raymond W. Kelly, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, vice Ronald K. Noble, resigned.

Charles O. Cecil,
of California, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Wendy Jean Chamberlin,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

James Francis Creagan,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

Lino Gutierrez,
of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

David C. Halsted,
of Vermont, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Dennis K. Hays,
of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname.

Dennis C. Jett,
of New Mexico, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

Tibor P. Nagy, Jr.,
of Texas, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

Donald J. Planty,
of New York, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala.

Submitted March 28

Johnny H. Hayes,
of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2005 (re-appointment).

Submitted March 29

Leslie M. Alexander,
of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ecuador.

Lawrence Baskir,
of Maryland, to be a Judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims for a term of 15 years, vice Reginald W. Gibson, retired.

Prudence Bushnell,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kenya.

Colleen Kollar-Kotelly,
of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Columbia, vice Harold H. Greene, retired.

M. Margaret McKeown,
of Washington, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice J. Jerome Farris, retired.

Withdrawn March 29

Mary Burrus Babson,
of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of one year (new position), which was sent to the Senate on January 22, 1996.

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 25

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released March 26

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Maj. Gen. Carol A. Mutter, USMC, to the rank of lieutenant general

Released March 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Education Secretary Richard Riley on the National Governors' Association education summit

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Daniel Tarullo on the Japan-U.S. agreement on air cargo services

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the Japan-U.S. agreement on air cargo services

Transcript of a press briefing by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros on the "one strike and you're out" initiative in public housing

Released March 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released March 29

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Vice President Albert Gore and Food and Drug Ad-

ministration Commissioner David Kessler on the anticancer initiative

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's upcoming visit to the Republic of Korea

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Court of Appeals Judge for the Ninth Circuit

Announcement of nomination for two U.S. District Court Judges

Announcement of nomination for Judges on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved March 22¹

H.J. Res. 165 / Public Law 104-118
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes

Approved March 26

H.R. 2036 / Public Law 104-119
Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996

Approved March 28

S. 1494 / Public Law 104-120
Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996

Approved March 29

H.R. 3136 / Public Law 104-121
Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996

H.J. Res. 170 / Public Law 104-122
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes

¹ This item was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.